

# **Altruism and Agriculture: The Ethics of Fictional Farmyards**

By Katherine Oakes

A thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at The Australian  
National University.

Copyright © 2021 by Katherine Oakes  
All Rights Reserved.

## Declaration

I hereby declare that, except where it is otherwise acknowledged in the text, this thesis represents my own original work.

Signed

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read 'K.O.', is written on a light-colored rectangular background.

Katherine (Kate) Oakes

## Acknowledgements

Firstly I want to acknowledge the skill, dedication, and kindness of Dr Lucy Neave and Professor Kate Mitchell, who alternated Chair of Panel responsibilities during my candidature. You've guided me and my work to a place very different from where I began and that I am very proud of. I simply would not have been able to make it here without your wisdom. Thank you for being mentors in scholarship and in life too.

To my parents, I want to thank you for encouraging learning for the sake of it, and for introducing me to Hardy and allowing us to walk in his woods together. What a pleasure it is to be your daughter.

My study buddies, the Pommers, the AD Hopeless gang, thank you for everything. Lou, Kat, Elena, Thomas, Miriam - thanks for listening, encouraging, commiserating, laughing, complaining, wine-drinking, reading, and of course pomming. Though the PhD was undoubtedly a challenge, you made it a delight.

To all my other friends and family, thank you for asking how it's going and sometimes for not asking. But look, it's done! I couldn't, in fact wouldn't, have done it without your love and support.

Lastly, it would be remiss of me not to mention Hardy, a man I've never met but feel I've come to know. I want to acknowledge the impact of Hardy's writing and his compassionate heart on not just my thesis but my whole life beyond it too.

## Abstract

This Creative Writing thesis comprises a creative and a critical component. The critical component, “An Arrant Traitor to His Defenceless Sheep”: Farmyard Ethics in the Fiction of Thomas Hardy’, examines the work of this canonical Victorian author. Hardy’s work is often characterised by biophilia, and the animal life represented in his fiction is complex, nuanced, and ideologically loaded. Scholars have long been fascinated by Hardy’s animals and their meanings in his works (West, Kreilkamp, Cohn, Sumpter, Levine, Beer, Sherman, Carroll, Martell, Fischler). While wild creatures and domestic pets in Hardy’s novels have received ample critical attention, livestock have been registered by only a few scholars. The thesis uses a theoretical approach from Animal Studies, an interdisciplinary project aimed at interrogating human-animal relations, as well as extensive existing research on Hardy’s fiction. It asks how an author so invested in animal welfare depicts an industry so founded upon animal exploitation, which is fundamental to Hardy’s landscape. To answer this question, the thesis examines three novels central to Hardy’s oeuvre that are characterised by their agricultural content. These are *Far from the Madding Crowd* (1874), *Tess of the d’Urbervilles* (1891), and *Jude the Obscure* (1895). I argue that Hardy’s depiction of livestock animals is best understood as displaying two competing discourses, one humanitarian in nature and the other utilitarian, and that the unreconciled contradictions of these competing discourses creates a lingering tension. This tension has the effect of creating a shocking and visceral experience of the farm which provokes further consideration of animal issues like carnism. Reading Hardy’s novels in this way opens up understandings of Hardy’s conceptions of human-animal relations and exposes the masterful literary techniques used in expressing them. The thesis also illuminates Victorian animal rights discourses, sets out their continuing implications today, and even more crucially, highlights the influential role that fiction can take in animal welfare discussions.

The creative and critical components are united in their desire to explore how fiction can grapple with the inherent ethical paradoxes of traditional animal farming. *Where Green Limbs Grow* depicts a rural community centred around animal farming. In the fictional hamlet of Westhill, newcomer Charlotte watches her farmer neighbours naming their animals and also consuming them, assisting in the birth of calves and dragging them from their mothers, sees their gentleness and their duplicity. Charlotte struggles to reconcile these components of the farmer’s role whilst simultaneously grappling with new realisations about her own animality.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgments . . . . .	3
Abstract . . . . .	4
Creative Component Title Page . . . . .	7
Chapter One . . . . .	9
Chapter Two . . . . .	20
Chapter Three . . . . .	36
Chapter Four . . . . .	49
Chapter Five . . . . .	61
Chapter Six . . . . .	73
Chapter Seven . . . . .	82
Chapter Eight . . . . .	93
Chapter Nine . . . . .	102
Chapter Ten . . . . .	118
Chapter Eleven . . . . .	128
Chapter Twelve . . . . .	140
Chapter Thirteen . . . . .	148
Critical Component Title Page . . . . .	162
Introduction . . . . .	163
Chapter One: Literature Review and Theoretical Approach . . . . .	175
Chapter Two: Hardy the Humanitarian . . . . .	191
Chapter Three: Hardy the Utilitarian . . . . .	215

Chapter Four: Hardy the Wordsmith . . . . .	241
Chapter Five: Coda . . . . .	264
References. . . . .	267

CRITICAL COMPONENT

“An Arrant Traitor to His Defenceless Sheep”:  
Farmyard Ethics  
in the  
Fiction of Thomas Hardy

## An Introduction to the Thesis

“What are my books but one plea against ‘man’s inhumanity to man’  
–and to woman–and to the lower animals?”  
(Hardy quoted in Millgate, *Thomas Hardy* 379)

Thomas Hardy, the Victorian novelist and poet, self-identified as an advocate of animal rights. His biophilia was expressed through charitable donations and public statements; this identity epitomised by the RSPCA’s commissioning of a poem from the author in 1924 (West 171). Hardy was the “first canonical British novelist” to engage with issues of animal-welfare (Kreilkamp, *Minor Creatures* 118), and animal life is present and vivid throughout his fictional oeuvre. As a result, scholarship has recognised his fascination with animals—both human and nonhuman—and the connections between them. To give an example, Hardy was an early convert to the science of Charles Darwin (Sherman, “Lower Animals” 304), and his fiction’s relationship to Darwinian science has been the focus of valuable analysis (Beer, Levine, Sumpter). In fact, for Hardy, as he articulated in his correspondence, “the most far-reaching consequence of the establishment of the common origin of all species is ethical”: the revelation of shared biology requiring an extension of “altruistic morals” to all living creatures (*Thomas Hardy’s Public Voice* 311). It is clear that the author felt passionately about animals and about treating them kindly. Equally, Hardy’s fiction and non-fiction writings depict their author as a complex and logical thinker. He was a reader of philosophy, scientific writing, and literature throughout his life. A record of his thinking survives through notebook entries, diaries, manuscripts, and letters. These documents establish his perceptions of human-animal relations as complex. One persistent and perplexing question was exactly how one might enact protection of animals in a society so dependent on their use and exploitation, one which saw them as “existing for human purposes” (West 157). In a letter to the Humanitarian League, Hardy wrote, “though we may not at present see how the principle of equal justice all round is to be carried out in its entirety, I recognise that the League is grappling with the question” (*Personal Notebooks* 311).

For Hardy, a place of particular ethical “grappling” was the animals used in everyday Victorian life: working animals and livestock. The author’s contemplations around using animals and his representation of working creatures are sites of conflict. Hardy’s farm animals demonstrate incongruous ideas and unstable meanings. I assert that because literary texts construct their own worlds, including the identity of their characters, institutions, and action, consequently the identity Hardy creates for the use of nonhumans—what he chooses to include and ignore, highlight and hide—conveys much about the ideologies of the author and the text’s meanings. There are clear advances that can be achieved through unpacking Hardy’s fictional animals more thoroughly. This thesis asserts that exploring Hardy’s fiction in this way—by looking to his agricultural animals—both extends the reach of important research considering the depiction of animals in literature (within the field known as Literary Animal Studies), and opens up new perceptions of Hardy’s fiction, uncovering its unique contribution to animal rights discourses that continue well into the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

### How Does Hardy Depict Agriculture?

To define the broader focus of the thesis as a whole (including both the creative and critical components), I consider how rural fiction set within agricultural, animal-saturated landscapes might depict human-animal relationships and animal utilisation. This broad focus leads to the tighter scope of this dissertation which itself seeks to answer the following question: how is Victorian animal agriculture—a site of major ethical concerns—represented in the novels of renowned animal advocate Thomas Hardy? How does a novelist who saw his craft as an “ethical art” (Sumpter 666), present an ethically complicated industry that is so central to his very landscape? I aim to discover whether it is possible to find meaningful patterns within the complicated nexus of feeling that surrounds livestock in his fiction. I argue that the inconsistent representations of livestock farming are best understood as expressions of at least two diverging perspectives on animal farming, illustrating a fascinating conflict in ideology and artistic vision. On the one hand Hardy was the poet-humanitarian of Victorian Britain, and yet on the other there is evidence that he was a pragmatic and utilitarian thinker. Reading Hardy’s novels through the lens of his

humanitarianism highlights his endorsement of altruistic morals, blurring of species boundaries, defence of animal bodies, and denunciation of agriculture's objectification. However, reading through Hardy's more utilitarian and anthropocentric leanings foregrounds farming where harshness is a necessity of survival, universal altruism is simply inconceivable, and human lives must take precedence over their nonhuman counterparts.

Together the novels depict animal agriculture as conducive to human-nonhuman connection and disconnection, subjectivity and objectification, interspecies community and species-based hierarchy. It is crucial to consider then what these two strands of vision—their coexistence and their conflict—might achieve. Far from creating ambiguity or an awkward style, as it might have under different hands, Hardy's dissonant mode is able to engage with the very real discords that exist within animal farming itself, creating a dialogue between the two realities. Significantly, I argue that this complex representation of livestock farming can be understood through the lens of cognitive dissonance; a distressing state in which incompatible emotions and cognitions are shown to coexist (Festinger 2). Hardy's representational style dramatises the ideological dissonances that permeate livestock agriculture. Alongside other scholars of various disciplines, this thesis engages with animal-related cognitive dissonance to demonstrate the value of understanding Hardy's farms in this way. I argue that Hardy's dramatising of animal paradoxes through dissonance allows the novels to transcend reduction to philosophical purity or easy simplicity for the sake of ontological consistency, and instead creates a nagging and lingering tension. Furthermore, the discomfort-inducing representation necessarily elicits an attitude of consideration in the reader who must experience each element of the farm as it occurs, and either sit with the tension or else feel motivated to reconcile the disparities for themselves. In this way, Hardy's novels function in the manner of literary animal rights studies, lacking all the didacticism and polemics of non-fiction materials, and conveying the many ethical and physical complications at play when humans domesticate and use animals. To further elucidate the research, my introduction to the thesis begins, as the research journey itself, with Hardy. From establishing an understanding of Hardy and the novels under study, I then demonstrate the research gap my thesis seeks to fill. Subsequently I set out the methods, structure, and dual components of the thesis.

## On the Author - A Complicated Man

Thomas Hardy was born in 1840 and died in 1924, and thus lived the great majority of his life under Queen Victoria. His first novel to achieve popular acclaim, *Far from the Madding Crowd* (1874) (henceforth referred to as *Madding Crowd*), was printed in serial form in *The Cornhill Magazine* and inspired comparisons to George Eliot. His last published novel was *Jude the Obscure* (1895) (henceforth referred to as *Jude*). The author turned to poetry thereafter. Hardy's writing is set predominantly in the fictional region of Wessex, a term he appropriated from Anglo-Saxon geography and applied to the general Dorset region in South-West England. Wessex is a rural, agricultural landscape of hamlets and villages, interspersed with larger towns, and became representative of a pre-modern and rustic lifestyle. Hardy's Wessex is populated with countless nonhuman animals. Thus in considering the author's understanding and depiction of animals and their utilisation, there is no more suitable site than the Wessex farmyard. Farming is particularly useful in a study of animal ethics because of the author's interest in welfare, and personal sensitivity to the lives of animals (Kreilkamp, "Anthroprosthesis" 38). The spaces of animal agriculture that feature in the collection entail various endeavours and practices which rely upon a variety of domesticated species, from pig farming to dairying. I have taken for my analysis three novels which feature these types of practices most prominently, these being *Madding Crowd*, *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* (1891) (henceforth referred to as *Tess*), and *Jude*. These novels contain long and vivid scenes set in agricultural contexts. Moreover, it is possible to take these three novels as emblematic of Hardy's novelistic achievement due to their prominence in the period and continuing association with the author's impact. These examples of 'Novels of Character and Environment', as Hardy referred to them, are arguably his most famous and most read. Though other novels are important in his canon, they feature much less animal agriculture. These three novels also have the benefit of spanning Hardy's novelistic career. In analysing them, the thesis' focus is on scenes enacted in agricultural spaces or involving agricultural animals either literally or metaphorically.

*Madding Crowd* centres around the amorous choices of young female farm owner Bathsheba Everdene. Her three keen bachelors include a shepherd named Gabriel Oak, a red coat named Sergeant Troy, and a landowner named Farmer Boldwood. Throughout the trials and tribulations of the plot the agricultural world is the source of life and dictates the calendar in their community, farming events marking the seasons not just of the natural world but also of the characters' narratives. The primary endeavour undertaken on Bathsheba's property, Weatherbury Farm, is sheep farming. The novel has been generally recognized as an example of pastoral literature. To provide a brief definition of the genre, pastoralism is characterised by its concern with sheep, shepherds, and rural goings-on (Squires 299), plus is typically set in what Jakob Lothe terms an "imaginary Golden Age" (125). Similarly for Michael Millgate, *Madding Crowd* epitomises pastoral conventions through Gabriel Oak's Arcadian flute playing, and the allusions to an "early world" of peaceful bucolic life ("Hardy's Achievement" 412). The pastoral sees the rural world as emblematic of harmony and antiquity, free of the horrors of modernity. Much of the scholarship on the novel takes as its focus the pastoral genre (Welsh, Kreilkamp "Pitying the Sheep", Squires), and the natural world (as it seems quite its own character here) (Babb, Morell, West). Representations of gender, which is most present in, though not limited to, Bathsheba's progressive view of the woman's role is also a site of critical attention (Shires, Boumelha, Henson). The centrality of farm life in the novel, plus its pastoral conventions, make it a fascinating and fruitful choice for an analysis of animal agriculture.

*Tess*, the second published novel of the trilogy I have curated for this study, was distributed in serial form in 1891. Unlike *Madding Crowd* which was considered a pleasant rural tale, upon reception *Tess* sparked controversy and complaint (Kramer 165). This reaction hinged on the action of the novel, in which Tess is raped and impregnated by a manipulative faux relative. Moreover, in Hardy's rendition of the attack and its ramifications Tess is ever the blameless victim, a deeply controversial position to hold in Victorian society. Hardy's perspective is reinforced, in the face of condemnation, by the subtitle to the novel which labels Tess "A Pure Woman". Consequently, literature around the novel often reads into its portrayal of gender and sexuality (Boumelha, Henson), and also encroaching modernity (Meadowsong, Martell). The key site for my reading of the novel is a dairy farm

called Talbothays where Tess works as a dairy maid to escape the whisperings and memories of her home village. The farm's produce is milk and butter and thus the central animal agriculture of the novel occurs through the milkers' contact with the milcher cows. *Tess* provides fascinating examples of Wessex farming because of these bovine-human interactions, its production of a seemingly pastoral ideal within a novel so dominated by tragedy, and the vividness and subtlety of Talbothays' farming community.

Finally, *Jude*, the last novel Hardy ever wrote, demonstrates the shift in style twenty years of novel writing can produce. This final text, and its series of ever more bleak events, is a far cry from the warm idyllic hue of *Madding Crowd*. The plot of *Jude* is built around the eponymous protagonist and his difficult journey through the excitements and frustrations of finding a purpose in life, in particular his disappointment about his lack of admission to the university in Christminster, a city that mimics Oxford. The narrative also works through his relationships with two women, his first wife Arabella, with whom he initially parts angry and disappointed, and Sue, his cousin with whom he feels a deep connection and husbandly love, but who will not marry him. While much of Jude's tale shifts between cities, agricultural work peppers the beginning chapters of the novel. Notable to my research is the pig breeding in which Arabella's family deals and in which Jude and Arabella dabble. In reading Hardy for his animals, scholars consistently reference a scene in which Jude must kill their pig (56), gaining the scene a kind of grisly fame. Other trends within literature around *Jude* include investigations into the text's didactic functions (Woolf, Holland, Panter); its generic conventions and ontologies (Pinion, Hassett, Sumpter); and its rhetorics regarding sexuality (Boumelha, Showalter). *Jude* is a significant text for my research because in this novel Hardy's twin discourses of humanitarian desires and utilitarian logic become most evident and most at odds.

### A Lacuna Around Livestock

In analysing Wessex farming, existing Hardy scholarship is an important starting point. However, although scholarship on Hardy is broad and immense, the agricultural animals of his Wessex world have not yet been given much attention. Viewing animals, animal spaces,

and animal industries as sites of academic inquiry is the product of a relatively young interdisciplinary field known as Animal Studies. The field is considered to have been given form by Peter Singer's *Animal Liberation*, published in 1975. Here Singer coins the term 'speciesism' to describe the way the species divisions between humans and nonhumans are used to defend actions that exploit animals and cause suffering. Singer rejects this species-based logic on various grounds, including the premise that despite clear differences between humans and other animals, we know, from both biological and empirical evidence, that animals can suffer. In Singer's words "[i]f a being suffers there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideration" (33). Animal Studies begins the process of considering the animal. The momentum of Animal Studies within each of its wide-ranging disciplines has been gradual, and the two substantial texts on Hardy's animals (that I come to below) were published in 2017 and 2018 respectively, and are therefore recent additions to the Hardy research which has spanned decades. The approaches of Animal Studies inform much of my analysis and so I return to the field in the literature review.

The recent critical turn towards animals helps explain the scarcity of work on Hardy's farm animals. Since considering animals is relatively new, work on subsets within that sphere (like livestock) has not yet been prioritised or is only beginning to emerge. Often in Hardy research, livestock is featured as part of a broader analysis that considers nonhumans in general (West, Cohn, Sumpter), or these animals fall obliquely under other projects, such as thinking about genre (Squires) or symbolism (Holland). Moreover, while important journal articles establish grounds for looking at agricultural creatures, often on a species specific basis (Kreikamp 'Pitying', Carroll, Martell, Ortiz-Robles "Hardy's Wessex"), farm animals are yet to receive sustained research as a group unto themselves. The liminal position of agricultural species, as neither pets within the home nor wild animals within nature, contributes to the lacuna in analysis in literary studies research. Livestock in Hardy's fiction, unlike wild animals, receive human ministrations, respond to human language, and engage in interspecies relationships (West 47). Yet they remain separate from the other categories of domestic creatures also, namely pets, who exist for reasons other than the products of their bodies (Kreilkamp, *Minor Creatures* 41). Ivan Kreilkamp

frames the position of working animals as prosthetic extensions of the human body, asking “[w]hat is the sheep, the cow, or the dog in its domestication but a projection or extension of human desires and needs?” (“Anthroprosthesis” 38). A domestic animal is part of the human world and yet ostracised from it, some species more so than others. Cows and sheep lack the domestic familiarity of dogs and yet also the poetic mystery and Romantic importance of birds of prey. Pets are the focus of Ivan Kreilkamp in his monograph *Minor Creatures: Persons, Animals, and the Victorian Novel* (2018), which thinks about the role of domestic animals in Victorian life and the Victorian novel, and at times expands out to include sheep, whilst avian species are the topic of Abdur Razaq, author of “Symbolic Significance of the Bird in Thomas Hardy’s *The Mayor of Casterbridge*”. Despite their seeming liminality and mundanity, even a cursory glance over Hardy’s livestock reveals strong feelings, striking liveliness, and most of all great diversity in representation. It is easy to juxtapose the grisly butchery in *Jude* with the heroic shepherding of Gabriel Oak in *Madding Crowd*. Similarly, there is clear discord between the brief sense of guilt Gabriel experiences while considering the fate of his sheep (33), and the unquestioning regularity with which he sends them off to market (257). Livestock serve as the focus for this project. While the farm as an environment is inseparable from agricultural animals, this thesis concentrates on the representation of sheep, cattle, and pigs on Hardy’s farms rather than on the spaces of the farm itself.

### Methodology

The methodological approach of this thesis entails forming succinct understandings of biographical material, primarily primary texts such as diary entries and letters, which contain Hardy’s thoughts on animals and their treatment. Using biographical information as a lens for close readings of Hardy is extremely common within scholarship on the author. The ambiguity and complexity of his writing can be illuminated in part by the plentiful nonfiction writings. From my biographical analysis, I produce two distinct personae evidenced by Hardy’s writing and reinforced by Anna West’s important monograph *Thomas Hardy and Animals* (2017), one seeing Hardy as a passionate humanitarian and the other a pragmatic, economic, and utilitarian thinker. Each persona then becomes a lens through

which to read his fiction and its agricultural animals. Reading with these lenses allows me to decode the perplexing images of Wessex farmyards. The collective pictures of Hardy's livestock can be thought of like a kaleidoscopic image, comprised of many varying colours, made up of jarring ideas and diverging feelings. The two lenses I have formed work to highlight and isolate hues within this colourful cluster. Each identity of the author is applied to his narratives to illuminate and decipher related images of animal scenes, much like a filter applied over a kaleidoscope highlights only certain tones of the image. Applying the humanitarian lens to Hardy's farms, for example, foregrounds a trans-species interest and consideration of welfare. By isolating distinct threads of feeling, the nexus of tangled depictions becomes more intelligible, allowing me to unpack and reintegrate the conflicting ideologies which structure Wessex agriculture.

In undertaking my analysis, this thesis takes the whole body of farming scenes involving animals that are scattered throughout the novels and thinks of them as a collective representation. Separating the novels would assume more difference than commonality, and reduces the ability of this thesis to explore how strains of imagery flow through different novels. It is important to note that while the three novels each handle agricultural animals in their own distinct way, I posit that the reasons livestock appear differently in different texts is less significant from an analytical perspective than the patterns that appear throughout texts. The variations between novels are predominantly a matter of stylistic choices, such as their genre and the finer technicalities such as the occupation of the novel's protagonist. Irving Howe writes about genre and theme in Hardy, arguing that frequently in his work "verisimilitude is subordinated to internal pressures of theme and vision" (368). Howe demonstrates that on some levels, reality, or at least Hardy's sense of it, conforms to generic expectations. To quote Hardy himself on this matter, he writes that "art is a disproportioning... of realities, to show more clearly the features that matter in those realities" (*Life and Work* 239). Different stories relate different realities from different points of view, and thus create essentially different worlds. This is a useful way of understanding diverging representations of agriculture in the novels: the colour and tone of its representation is determined by other narrative pressures. It becomes evident

then, why *Madding Crowd*, the famously pastoral tale written early in Hardy's career, depicts more of an archaic sense of harmony between humans and their livestock.

But while narrative functions such as genre have an impact on the representational style of a novel and the world it builds, genre is not stable within Hardy and therefore considering novels and farm animals on a case by case basis becomes reductive. Each novel demonstrates conventions of a dominant genre and yet also modification and crossover. This leads Michael Squires to convincingly argue, for example, that *Madding Crowd* should be understood as "modified pastoral" (300). Whilst the novel demonstrates certain pastoral conventions such as kindly shepherds and rustic lifestyles, it subverts pastoral convention in the way it allows certain distressing elements of rural life into the tale (229). In Squire's words "[b]efore the novel's essential realism, prettiness disappears" (299). Narrative structures certainly tilt the idea of farming in certain directions but do not hold them firm. The dominant characterisation of a novel's agriculture does not exist solely within that novel but has echoes and allusions in other narratives also. The shifts in image between different novels are not straightforward, singular, strictly chronological, nor easy to grasp. The diverse images of farming occur not just in the collective depiction of the farm but even within single novels. Thus it seems then that the most appropriate way to begin unpacking this collection of farming representations is to isolate the themes that pervade and repeat.

### Thesis Structure

The first chapter after this introduction sets out a literature review and theoretical basis for the research. Afterwards the thesis follows a three-chapter structure which can be understood as following the "thesis, antithesis, and synthesis" style. Chapter Two takes the first of my two lenses, Hardy the humanitarian, and applies it to the novels in question. Chapter Three takes the second lens, Hardy the utilitarian, and reads agriculture in the novels in this way. These two chapters make it clear that Hardy's farms can be both dolorous places and yet sites of true compassion, both unconscionable and necessary. My fourth chapter takes this conflict as its focus and illustrates the cognitive dissonance state that the inconsistencies of Wessex farming generate. In this chapter I seek to draw together

the previous two chapters into a final, closing analysis. Each of these chapters within the thesis contains an analysis of the crucial terminology involved (such as humanitarianism, utilitarianism, and cognitive dissonance) plus literature reviews of relevant sources. The fifth and final chapter offers a brief conclusion to the thesis as a whole.

### The Two Components of the Thesis

Lastly, in setting out the broader character of this thesis it is important to highlight the foundational and inspirational role of rural landscapes. The work of this PhD is an extension of my Honours thesis and its focus on the bucolic world of Hardy's fiction. A fascination with the agrarian spaces Hardy represents and imagines, combined with my own connections to the English countryside, inspired both the critical and creative components of this research project. A key theme that grounds and connects the creative and critical components is an interest in animal life and how it merges with the human; I am fascinated by the boundaries, physical and conceptual, that we build and also dissolve between humans and nonhumans. Livestock are a useful and ideologically loaded site for exploring human-nonhuman separations and connections. These animals are colleagues and yet also consumed. I am most captivated by how these boundaries play out in rural sites where animals are more present: where wild animals can roam, and the human population engages in activities and labours with domesticated species. By extension, my research considers how these interactions might be represented in fiction. This interest is framed by a larger passion for documenting the cultures (human and beyond) of idiosyncratic British localities.

By considering livestock in this manner—creatively and critically—I hope to motivate further thought on livestock in literature, that of Hardy and beyond, and on the existence of real farm animals, both historically and in the machine of modern farming practices. Much like Hardy's fiction, this thesis traverses the tumultuous territory of the farmyard. To guide the work, my research consistently prioritises a question: how can literature dramatise the violent incongruities of farming? This thesis responds in a creative manner by depicting a farming community inspired and shaped by animals and yet also in the habit of butchering

them, and in a critical manner by highlighting what I describe as Hardy's disparate and provocative style of rendering the farm.

## **Chapter One: Literature Review and Theoretical Approach**

The questions this thesis asks emerge from a collection of discourses, including those exploring Victorian literature, animal rights, and the work of Hardy. In the following section I set out these spheres of knowledge and the thesis' relationship to each of them. I contextualise Hardy within his Victorian influences, all the while thinking particularly about animals. From here I shift into Animal Studies and its theoretical basis, explaining the central tenets of the field and how it applies to my research. With these foundational understandings established, in the second half of this chapter I conduct a closer analysis of the most relevant theoretical and secondary literature, in order to outline the work still to be done, how my thesis undertakes this work, and lastly, its significance to the broader fields of both Animal Studies and Hardy scholarship.

### The Victorian Era and Animals

To some extent, Hardy's troubled representations of animals are a result of the ethical inquiries and progress of his period. His work and philosophies are more completely understood as within, and yet also in exception to, Victorian sentiment for animals. Kreilkamp neatly demonstrates the growing consideration of animals during the Victorian era through four main events: the establishment of Martin's Act (1822) which protected cattle from cruelty, the founding of the SPCA (1824), the passing of the Cruelty to Animals Act (1876), and the beginnings of antivivisection campaigns towards the end of the century (*Minor Creatures* 187). That is not to say that these developments were not without opposition. These cultural movements and challenges, their history, and their representation in literature, is something Kreilkamp marks out as "less well-considered" than other similar events of the era (*Minor Creatures* 34) and this thesis aims to contribute to new recognition. The major developments Kreilkamp sets out provide a snapshot of the multi-faceted relationship of the Victorian public to the animal population. Theresa Mangum gives her own evocative snapshot of the animal sights, smells and sounds a

Victorian Londoner would have encountered in daily life. She depicts the “veritable animal sensorium” including animal carcasses at markets, horse manure in the streets, and the barking of dogs (Mangum 15). This ubiquity of animality, not just in London but even more profoundly in the countryside, is a useful base in establishing how animals existed in the Victorian imagination.

The most relevant site of human-animal connection in relation to this thesis is the humanitarian movement that emerged in Victorian England. Harriet Ritvo’s monograph *The Animal Estate* (1987) investigates the narratives and discourses around animals in 19<sup>th</sup> century Britain to determine the roles they played in the culture of the period, including the humanitarian movement. She discerns the relationships depicted in key texts created by real people who had contact with animals (4), rather than the relationships between humans and animals in fictional texts. In the four sections of her work she looks to a particular type of human-nonhuman relationship and uncovers the underlying discourse which structured it. For instance, she examines the way zoo keeping and hunting reinforced a narrative of British imperialism, whilst cattle breeding and dog showing bolstered a sense of human primacy and biological control (5). Her reliance on case studies from nonfiction texts means the affective and imaginary character of human-animal relations in fiction merits further exploration. In considering the progress of humanitarianism, Ritvo uncovers its ties to national and class identities. Part of the humane movement’s presentation to the public involved claims that animal protection was a uniquely British trait (127). Simultaneously public discourses around animal cruelty had distinctly classist overtones, the largely middle-class members of the leagues and organisations expressing rhetorics that “isolated and stigmatized a large segment of the Victorian public” (Ritvo 136), namely classes above or below its own (West 167). Engaging in animal charity work and condemning animal suffering were components of Victorian identity construction as part of the empire, the British people, and of one’s own class. In Hardy’s time, calling for animal protection meant an alignment in terms of social status, nationality, and imperial politics. Humanitarianism was complicated, and even contaminated, by goals other than the obvious.

Further contributing to this layered and subconscious rhetoric around animals were schisms that are difficult to reconcile. On the one hand Victorians bestowed great luxury upon their animals, yet on the other they abused and rejected them. Ritvo explores pet-keeping in her chapter “Prize-Pets”, noting that by the mid-century the “Victorian cult of pets” was well underway (86). Pets were so adored in the Victorian home that they were often preserved in taxidermy (Amato 6), or depicted in family portraits (Mangum 23). This image of harmonious domestic relations jars with the work of the Battersea Dog Home, an institution established in order to house and then destroy dogs seized by the police (Hamilton 88). The aim of the operation was returning dogs to owners but much more often their seizure led to their death, a statistic that the Home “never attempted to conceal” (Hamilton 89). In fact, the Battersea Dog Home allowed a family magazine to take photographs of dogs both pre- and post-euthanasia (Hamilton 91); their supporting article expressing satisfaction with the equipment used to dispose of the animals (Hamilton 96). Evidently, while canine euthanasia was not the object of the Battersea Home, it was a by-product of animal domestication that the Victorian public could swallow with little discomfort. The contemporary feelings around domestic pets provide a glimpse into the coexisting attachment and fickleness of the Victorian public, and the precarious position of their animals.

From even a preliminary understanding of the fascinating and sometimes disturbing ideas around animals in the period, it becomes clear why Victorian writers like Hardy are a rewarding site of analysis for scholars of animals and of Victorian studies. Hardy’s desire for animal rights was characteristic of his era. Equally the movement advocating kindness towards animals was not solely about the animals themselves. Hardy’s philosophies, ideologies, and depictions of animals existed within this rhetorically complex web spun around animal lives. Hardy’s animals can be considered in a similar way to Kristin Brady’s understanding of Hardy’s gendering of his characters; that the author is “an unstable conduit for the proliferation of various and conflicting discourses” (103). Hardy’s work expresses the conflicts, questions, and progress of the period and the author himself. He also interacted with animals on a daily basis. The Hardys were avid pet-owners, and rather shockingly, Thomas at times accepted the necessity of dispatching his pets without

expressing much displeasure (*Collected Letters* III 335). Hardy's complex passion for animal lives requires contextualisation within this period of shifting ideologies and conflicting feelings around animals. However, Hardy was also expressive of much more progressive ideas about animals than the general Victorian populace—ideas such as questioning and debunking the very boundaries perceived between human and nonhuman creatures (West 156)—and in this way his writing is intriguing for scholars of Animal Studies.

### A Creatural Theoretical Approach

Animal Studies, as the name suggests, has animality at its centre, and thinks critically about the animal's physical and conceptual position within modern society. As part of this interdisciplinary consideration, deconstructing the foundations of ideas around humanity and nonhumanity is the central purpose, with the ultimate goal a shift away from damaging anthropocentrism which enables animal cruelty of staggering degrees, in order to create more egalitarian and multi-species futures. Questions regarding human-animal relations, and more specifically, what might separate humans from general animality, have long been the focus of philosophical debate from Aristotle, to Descartes, to Heidegger. While these philosophers aimed to uncover the meaning of human exceptionalism, others questioned that exceptionalism itself. Scholars in the Animal Studies field identify French philosopher Jacques Derrida as a founding voice; in fact, Claire Charlotte McKechnie and John Miller express how the field has been "nourished" by Derrida's late work (438). The most notable of these works is his essay "The Animal that Therefore I am (More to Follow)" the title a pun on the French words for 'am' and 'follow', suggesting a fluidity of interrelations with the animal that the author might both be and also follow in the footsteps of. In this essay Derrida draws on an interaction with his pet cat as a case study, in which he is naked and notices himself as the object of his cat's gaze. The gaze becomes an exemplar of the meaningful communications between species, which in itself requires a recognition of nonhuman agency. Equally though, this gaze embodies the problems inherent in human-nonhuman communication, problems of ethics, politics, social justice, and complete otherness (Kreilkamp, 'Dying' 85). While recognising the otherness of the cat, Derrida

interrogates the absolute and elementary boundary between humans and animals, plus the history, creation, and violence of that perceived boundary.

This philosophical work is exemplified in Derrida's rejection of the singular word 'animal', which he sees as ineffective as a sign for the heterogeneous nature of all living beings. In its place he suggests a term of his own coinage: 'animot', which combines "an oral homophone for animals (*les animaux*) with a singular form of 'word' (*le mot*)" (West 162). Kreilkamp impressively articulates the conceptual weakness and hypocrisy within the term animal when he states that it is both a biological state that includes humanity, whilst also an "ethico-political category" from which the human is excluded and defined against ('Animal' 571-2). As Kreilkamp further writes, "[t]o be human, then, is to claim for oneself both the power to remove oneself from biological reality—to *not* be animal, even when one actually is one—and the power to rule over and to oversee the realm of the non-human" (Kreilkamp, 'Animal' 572). Part of Derrida's deconstruction of the term animal and its generalisation is a related project of exploring the way all beings possess an "unsubstitutable singularity" (Derrida 9); the idea that each and every living animal is unique and in its uniqueness, unknowable. Anna West describes the way this unknowability informs relationships across species boundaries—particularly human and nonhuman—but also within species, another human's consciousness no more penetrable than another animal's, signifying the alterity of all creatures (9). In considering the significance of Derrida's philosophy in Animal Studies, concepts such as deconstructing boundaries, reconsidering communication and categorisation, and recognising trans-species alterity are key. My thesis explores these key concepts in relation to Hardy's livestock.

Another founding voice within Animal Studies, John Berger, is particularly apt for a study of Hardy in his centring of the Industrial Revolution. While perceptions of the animal as lesser are in some senses a legacy of ancient cultural values, such as Judeo-Christian narratives of dominion—as explored by Derrida—the hugely influential work of Berger points to the massive restructuring of human-animal relationships during the Industrial Revolution and the "profound separation" (Armstrong 1) this enacted between the human and natural worlds. In Berger's words "[d]uring the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the internal combustion

engine displaced draught animals in streets and factories. Cities, growing at an ever increasing rate, transformed the surrounding countryside into suburbs where field animals, wild or domesticated, became rare” (12-3). While the exact period Berger cites predates Hardy’s lifetime, the processes to which Berger refers began to take shape during the Industrial Revolution, an event which characterises the Victorian age. In this creeping separation of human and animal, Berger claims, relationships between these species groups became largely fabricated, family pets made like furry children, and wild animals made part of an illusionary spectacle, enacted in places like zoos and picture books where the narratives we have built around animals are more prevalent than the animals themselves. As a result, “animals appear like fish seen through the plate glass of an aquarium” (Berger 16). For scholars of animal studies, and likewise this thesis, the relationship is problematic and requires critical attention.

Further direction for Animal Studies research is provided by Philip Armstrong who sees the field as actively resisting the anthropocentricity of modern human-animal relationships to instead open up the possibilities of what animals could mean as their own beings with “significances, intentions, and effects quite beyond the designs of human beings” (2). Essentially Animal Studies seeks to foreground the nonhuman in reaction and resistance to the persistent supremacy of the human, and in doing so interrogate the stubborn and harmful abyss between human and nonhuman lives. A related and important point, particularly for this research, is the role of language in perpetuating human-animal divisions. As a result scholars often enlist the term ‘nonhuman’ in place of ‘animal’ in order to avoid suggesting that humans are not also animals. However, even this construction suggests anthropocentric thinking, by grouping all other animals within a category defined by its lack of humanness. Ultimately linguistic non-anthropocentrism is impossible, our language a human device expressing its deeply human infrastructure. Within this thesis I use the terms nonhuman, animal, and creature to mean species other than humans, alternating between them for the sake of variety.

Thinking about animals is an interdisciplinary and broad ranging project, and my own research takes a literary angle. Because Animal Studies expands into areas as disparate

as biology, geography, sociology, and history, work must be done in each discipline to appropriate the broader project of the field to their own unique capabilities. This goal becomes fraught when thinking about literature because any foregrounding of the animal must occur through primarily anthropocentric structures, such as fictional forms and genres. However if, as Berger argues, our relationship with animals has become largely superficial and figurative, then logically there is no more suitable focus than the origin of the fictional itself to examine the character of that relationship. Alongside Mario Ortiz-Robles, this thesis asserts that literary studies is “the discipline within the humanities best equipped to account for the figurative character of our engagement with the world” and can therefore “tell us something valuable about animals that we would otherwise ignore” (*Literature and Animal Studies* ix-x). Narratives reveal much about how we perceive the animal world and our relationship to it (Herman ix). Ortiz-Robles tackles the “literary character of our relation to animals” (*Literature and Animal Studies* x), and I take as the foundation of my methodology an analysis of the literary character of Wessex livestock and their farming.

Reading animals in this way attempts to bridge the conceptual and physical abyss created between humans and nonhumans, and there are few divides more apt for bridging than “the intangible distance that separates the food we eat from the animals that lived only to provide it” (Ortiz-Robles, *Literature and Animal Studies* xi). In this way literary farms are provocative and ample sites of analysis. Moreover, literature works as a marker of perceived reality and also a suggestion of alternative realities (Ortiz-Robles, *Literature and Animal Studies* xi). In fact, literature has the ability to be speculative about creaturely futures plus deeply influential in shaping those futures. These functions of literature are the focus of David Herman’s analysis in *Narratology Beyond the Human: Storytelling and Animal Life* (2018). Here Herman seeks to establish an analytical approach to post-Darwinian narratives about animals, in order to understand how literature manifests, and even more significantly creates, attitudes towards nonhumans (xi). The sources of interest to Herman consist of a broad range of narrative types from graphic novels to films. This thesis further contributes to the goals of Herman and Ortiz-Robles to construct our knowledge of narratological animal portraits and their societal repercussions.

## The Key Sources

Within Animal Studies, there are two key sources which are most directly relevant to the work of this thesis; my research extends the reach of their analysis into new territory. The scholarship of Anna West and Ivan Kreilkamp exists within a sphere of research which reads Victorian texts and authors from an Animal Studies perspective. Ritvo's book *The Animal Estate* is a seminal work in the field and exemplifies the aims of Victorian Animal Studies in its focus on the exploitative position of animals, the importance of the animal figures themselves, its analysis of the discourses that structured animals in the contemporary consciousness, and perhaps most significantly its striving to encourage progress in modern ideologies regarding the animal (McKechnie and Miller 437). Other notable texts include *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representations of Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture* (Morse and Danahay 2007) and *Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture: Contexts for Criticism* (Mazzeno and Morrison 2017) which each comprise essays that explore both Victorian events and institutions, such as the Battersea dog home (Hamilton) and Smithfield meat market (Morrison, "Dickens"), and Victorian texts, including *Wuthering Heights* (1847), *Black Beauty* (1877), and *Great Expectations* (1861). The field simultaneously investigates "historical-cultural factors" throughout the era, and also their relevance and contribution to the "human-animal axis in current theoretical debates" (McKechnie and Miller 438). Victorian Animal Studies then looks both backwards and forwards, outwards and inwards, thinking literarily, philosophically, and historically.

This is true of Ivan Kreilkamp's journal articles and his monograph *Minor Creatures: Persons, Animals and the Victorian Novel* (2018). While the book spans numerous Victorian novels, it culminates in the work of Hardy, with two chapters dedicated to the author and his representation of nonhumans, with a specific focus on *Madding Crowd*, because "it so well illustrates dynamics that are important throughout much of his fiction" (126). The author argues for a non-anthropocentric reading of Victorian novels in order to recognise the presence and contribution of nonhuman characters. The purpose of this analytical work is to make visible the way novels of the period use animals to reinforce and yet also contest

the separation of human and nonhuman. Kreilkamp demonstrates the progress of Victorian fiction towards rethinking human-nonhuman divisions and their functioning, and importantly the dawn of resistance to these previously solid understandings (12). The author takes Hardy's fiction as representative of this resistance.

In the first of the two chapters on Hardy, Kreilkamp reads Hardy's animal and human lives as profoundly connected and intertwined (119). He argues that Hardy's desire to articulate more animal-centred narratives is evident in his novels, but ultimately this desire was restricted by the novel form itself, due to its "intransigent human-centeredness" (124). Kreilkamp argues that this led to Hardy's shift into poetry which was more able to cater to his transpecies interest. In making this argument Kreilkamp looks to the sheep in *Madding Crowd*. He describes his approach to Hardy's novels as 'ovine criticism', borrowing the term from Hardy, which involves the consideration of the "potential meaning of and produced by animals" (141). He aims to show that Hardy's writing "repays" this kind of reading and requires looking past the humanness of the standard novel form. The second chapter of the book which considers Hardy, titled "Tracking Animal Agency in Conan Doyle and Hardy", follows Derrida's analysis on animal communication by considering the possibilities of animal signification in fiction (144). Kreilkamp does this by focusing on the literal and physical tracks left behind by the fictional animals. The chapter puts forward that:

this late-century preoccupation with animal tracks offered an alternative to the *Black Beauty* fantasy of translation from equine to human, instead emphasizing the value of what we could define as an alternate, more epistemologically modest model of what I'll be calling transcription, implying a registration or recording of animal signification without an attempt at translation. (*Minor Creatures* 146)

In this way animal signs, like hoof prints, make imprints on the same Wessex world as human efforts, and these signs are recorded by Hardy as their own form of communication outside of human linguistic norms (154). These two chapters together encapsulate Kreilkamp's focus on domestic animal narratives, the boundaries between humans and the animals they own, the identity and unknowability of animal communication, and the

manner of Hardy's pushing back against formal boundaries that curb the influence of nonhuman beings in their fictional representations.

This thesis builds upon Kreilkamp's important work in two key ways. Firstly, by adjusting the scope of the research in order to create a more thorough understanding of a smaller area. Kreilkamp's scope is both broad, considering domestic species in general and their impact on the novel form, and also becomes specific, narrowing in on, for instance, animal tracks, and communication. My work endeavours to forge a path somewhere between these two poles, that narrows in on livestock but also aims to conduct a thorough analysis of various farm animal species in three different novels, to create the beginnings of an overarching understanding of livestock in Hardy's novelistic works. Secondly, this thesis builds on Kreilkamp by turning towards a focus largely overlooked, though often referenced, by the work: Hardy's ethical views on nonhumans. While the monograph considers Hardy for his animals, and highlights the significance of his historical moment for animal welfare and Hardy's compassion for animal lives, thus foregrounding animal ethics, it does not take ethics themselves as a central point of analysis. Kreilkamp's reading of domestic animals considers, in a general sense, how they might express Hardy's humanitarian leanings through his fiction. However these leanings themselves are complex and contentious. Kreilkamp never suggests or assumes Hardy's work or philosophy to be simple, but equally nor does he analyse the complexity of Hardy's views on animals.

The contentiousness and complexity of Hardy's humanitarianism, a key idea for the thesis, is uncovered and explored by Anna West. West's monograph *Thomas Hardy and Animals* (2017), the second of my key resources, addresses Hardy in terms of his creaturely ideologies, building this analysis through an exploration of a broad range of animal species throughout various novels and poems. The book considers the animals in Hardy as a whole, including wild animals, pets, and farm animals. West summarises by stating that: "Each chapter will suggest that Hardy reconfigured these traditional boundaries [between humans and nonhumans] as Mobius strips" - ones which suggest both human and animal alterity (13). Her chapters explore:

the appearance of creatures in the “Novels of Character and Environment,” locating the term and its usage in Hardy’s lexicon; [follow] the dogs and sheep of *Far from the Madding Crowd* in an exploration of Hardy’s stance on the Victorian debates over moral sense, moral agency, and moral responsibility in regards to nonhuman others; [reflect] on the role of language, the possession of a face, and the ability to suffer in constructing what it means to be a human or animal; and [consider] his involvement in the humanitarian movement. (187)

Of note for my research is West’s analysis of the sheep in *Madding Crowd* and the pig slaughtering in *Jude*. In summation, West’s work is most interested in boundaries, the ones established, questioned, undermined, and also erased between humans and animals in Hardy’s fiction.

The final chapter in the monograph, titled “Useful Creatures: Rethinking Hardy’s Humanitarianism”, is perhaps the single most influential piece of scholarship for my research. Here West highlights the traditional understanding of Hardy’s humanitarianism to then examine and complicate it. West begins the chapter by quoting from a letter Hardy wrote to his first wife Emma in which the author comments upon his plans to drown all but one of the kittens to be born to their pet cat (*Collected Letters* III 335). It appears the Hardys simply did not have the time, space, or desire to secure the welfare of a whole litter of kittens. It is an image at odds with Hardy’s traditional identity as an advocate of animal rights. West uses this excerpt to demonstrate the gap in Hardy’s life between what he thought ‘ought’ to happen and what was necessary (157). His views on animal suffering and death are further complicated by his belief that killing could be a humane choice if the life to be lived was likely to be one of suffering (West 189). When seen in this light the drowning of nearly all of a litter of kittens could be regarded as an act of altruism. It becomes clear then that Hardy’s humanitarian impulses were hindered, confused, and at times ambivalent. Having established this new and more subtle perception of Hardy’s humanitarian identity, West uses that identity as a tool to read Hardy’s relationship to horses and to his own pets. She considers both the primary biographical materials that exist, such as Hardy’s notebooks and letters, and his fiction, including novels and poetry.

The literary manifestations of Hardy's complex ethical feeling are not explored in comprehensive detail by West in the chapter.

My thesis takes West's approach and repurposes it in order to extend it. I argue that building a more nuanced picture of the author enables a thorough understanding of what his fiction might depict and produce. The Wessex world is illuminated by contextual and biographical explorations. While acknowledging that there are certainly significances and meanings within the fiction beyond the author's intentions, this thesis argues that by illuminating Hardy's competing ideologies and the rhetoric he channels, it is possible to untangle and make sense of the diverse, incongruous images of the farmyard that he produces. West limits the use of her biographical research as a reading tool, examining horses and pets only, and spends more time analysing primary nonfiction materials than applying it to the fiction in question. This thesis takes West's use of nonfiction evidence and her establishment of Hardy's complicated humanitarianism, to create the dual identity concept—Hardy the humanitarian and Hardy the utilitarian—which can then be transformed into a reading style. In doing so, and applying it to Hardy's farm animals, I come to conclusions that differ quite drastically from the assessment West is able to make. West argues that while Hardy's daily life and philosophy on animal treatment was confused and fraught, comparatively "it is in his fiction that he most clearly accomplishes his goal" to work against the suffering of animals and promote compassion (165). He does this, West asserts, through questioning species divisions, and an "emphasis on embodiment and on creatureliness" which "reminds one to attend to sensory experience and to the multiplicity of modes of being" (West 187). Essentially West suggests that Hardy uses fiction to express his idealistic and altruistic feeling, while his everyday life demonstrates economic, utilitarian, and pragmatic thinking. However, I problematise the idea that his fiction primarily enacts the author's altruistic and idealistic impulses. In terms of the farmyard, an innately utilitarian space, both a desire for compassion and the necessity of survival are dramatised and condoned. The combination of idyllic pastoralism and frustrated realism apparent in agriculture's rendering exhibits Hardy's own perception of Wessex as a "partly real, partly dream-country" (*Preface to Madding Crowd* 5). In this way the fiction actually

becomes a place to explore the tangible contradictions of the Victorian reality regarding animal lives.

The work of West and Kreilkamp makes clear the benefits of considering Hardy for his animals, while also paving the way for research yet to be done. This thesis seeks to advance into areas left unconsidered by West and Kreilkamp, as representative of this esoteric discourse which unites Hardy and Animal Studies. Most evident is the lack of focus on livestock. As a reviewer of West, R. D. Morrison, notes the broad scope of her monograph “prevents [West] from offering a comprehensive analysis of the vast array of animals that appear in Hardy” (459). With a unique relationship to humans, livestock are one such group that benefit from their own focus. The great disparity between livestock and other domesticated animals is articulated by Erica Fudge, prominent Animal Studies historian, when she writes “[i]n one area—pet ownership—the animal is identified, given a name and a status, whereas in the others—food and clothing—the individual animal disappears” (*Animal* 27). By thinking about farm animals as a group unto themselves I redress this gap in Hardy scholarship. Accordingly, I think more about the fields than the farmhouse, more about the animals out on the heath than at the hearth. Thinking in this way leads one to Hardy’s most notorious novel, *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*. Due to the broadness of the topic at hand—animals in Hardy—and the sheer amount of animals that live in Hardy’s novels and his poetry, neither Kreilkamp nor West give much room to *Tess*. In fact, in the final chapter of *Thomas Hardy and Animals*, West signals directions for future research when she notes that “[m]ore could be written on Hardy’s animals (especially his cows, who so often appear as named individuals in the text)” (188). The dairy herd in *Tess* are no doubt the animals West refers to, these creatures appearing as minor characters in their own right. Due to the spotlight this research projects onto livestock, *Tess* is highlighted as a critical text, its cows a key focus, and new revelations about the novel and its creaturely ideologies are prioritised.

## Significance of the Research

The significance of the research can be seen in two key spheres: literary understandings of Hardy and interdisciplinary explorations of animal issues. In illuminating Wessex farm animals this thesis is able to broaden current knowledge of Hardy's narrative techniques and unique stylistic manoeuvres. Equally, in examining Hardy's writing this research opens up perceptions of Victorian ideologies about animals and their continuing legacies. Hardy's writing illuminates worthwhile findings about animals while demonstrating much about his literary achievement. As part of analysing and expanding the complex layers of Hardy's fiction, my research orders this multiplicity of images of animal farming into recognisable ideologies, ones that can no doubt be tracked through the rest of his oeuvre. Furthermore, through engaging with the antithetical components of Hardy's writing, new clarity is gained about the paradoxes inherent within Victorian perceptions of animals. In analysing 19<sup>th</sup> century human-animal relations, as they are imagined on the page, my research is able to contribute to the ever more comprehensive history of interspecies relationships that Victorian Animal Studies works towards. This PhD establishes the key role of literature in that process, and the medium's unique ability to grapple with the unstable, contradictory, and emotive character of human-animal relations. Lastly, in placing livestock animals at the centre of my research, a group which is often ethically and cognitively unpleasant for readers, their position is highlighted and questioned within Hardy's fiction, Hardy's period, and importantly in ways that are analogous with livestock's continuing role in modern society.

Livestock are a key focus of both foundational and emerging thought in Animal Studies. Farming is critical for scholars because of its ethical and environmental importance, and this significance is heightened by the modern prevalence of factory farming. Research in this sphere seeks to understand the interspecies power dynamics (Taylor, Cole, Cohen), the production mechanisms (Thompson), and the role of technology within agricultural environments (Holloway). In terms of ethics in relation to farms, there are two sites of concern: consumption itself and the conditions of production (Thompson). The abhorrence of industrial conditions and necessity of concern for animal bodies were a

focus of Ruth Harrison's influential book *Animal Machines* (1964) which exposed the conditions animals experienced in UK farms and spurred animal activism on the issue. Scholars assert that promoting veganism through research, and therefore reducing carnism, is central to any progress towards ethical human-animal relationships. For instance, Carol Gigliotti argues in her essay "The Struggle for Compassion and Justice through Critical Animal Studies", featured in the *Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies*, that meat eating forms the crux of contemporary animal injustices. By focusing on the meat itself, this thesis is able to foreground philosophical explorations of carnism and the conditions of animal domestication. Since the conditions of modern factory farming are widely recognised by the field and animal advocates as deplorable, pre-modern husbandry is a site beyond the normal focus of these thinkers and a more complex ethical sphere to explore. This thesis explores three novels' engagement with the cognitive, visceral, and moral problems surrounding pre-modern livestock farming. These fictional depictions are a strength of the narratives and impact upon the reader experience. If Animal Studies is to deconstruct carnism and its associated injustices, then literature must be part of that process, and this thesis advances that effort.

Lastly, part of Animal Studies's concentration on farms involves seeking progress toward brighter interspecies futures through advocating for the reduction of the negative environmental impacts of animal farming. Bernard E. Rollin takes as his focus the contrast between traditional husbandry and American factory farming practices in his essay "This Ain't Agriculture" in order to elucidate the extreme ecological destruction of the industry's industrialisation. He highlights the use of "huge tractors for tillage, irrigation systems, fertilizers, pesticides and herbicides" (87) and the costs of such choices including unbalanced ecosystems, clearing of wooded land, immense water and fuel usage, air and water pollution, and eventual soil erosion and degradation (ibid). These impacts are noted by scholarship and fiction alike. James Rebanks's memoir *English Pastoral: An Inheritance* (2020) is an exploration of the transformations occurring in his English home county due to a recent turn towards more intensive farming practices. The changes he laments include reductions in biodiversity and soil quality. Farming's evolving nature, its past and its

futures, are all key areas of research for Animal Studies, and areas this thesis is well equipped to contribute to.

While Hardy's writing does not deal directly with issues like water pollution or pandemics, complex animal issues are dealt with so elegantly and compellingly by his dissonant style that new possibilities are opened up for the literary articulation and dissemination of animal issues. In the exploration of crucial environmental concerns, Hardy's style can be enlightening for both readers and writers of fiction. Moreover, the ontology Wessex creates has no room for the kind of destruction of nature that factory farming entails. Hardy creates a broader philosophy of balance—though a tense one—between humanitarian and utilitarian positions in which the brutal production of industrial farming is unthinkably one-sided. A feat the novels enact, that I come to expand upon in Chapter Four, is their ability to prompt reader consideration of animal farming's ethical complexities and injustices. In exhibiting this, the thesis demonstrates the usefulness and subtlety of Hardy's work, and fiction more broadly, in animal rights movements. Animal issues are increasingly becoming central to our most pressing public discourses, such as those about the environment, health, conservation, and living wages. In an article for *The New Yorker*, Dan Kaufman describes the shift to factory farming and its effects on rural Wisconsin's farmers, both those who have made the change and those who are resisting intensive operations. In this region, as in many others, Kaufman finds that farming is not just about food; it is increasingly political. In fact the author stresses that the perceived desirability of the agricultural policies for farmers offered by the Democratic and Republican representatives will determine much of future American elections. What we farm, what we eat, and where we buy it are political stances. Within an atmosphere of contention, conversation, and change, this thesis is a timely analysis of how we have viewed animals raised for meat and how that relationship can be interrogated as part of moving towards a more thoughtful future.

## Chapter Two: Hardy the Humanitarian

A survey of the representations of farming in the three novels, *Madding Crowd*, *Tess*, and *Jude*, reveals images of hard toil, harsh environments, and terrified animals, and yet it also uncovers farms as idyllic safe havens of pastoral life. These conflicting characterisations are an example of the diverse and tangled portrayals of Wessex animal agriculture that the thesis takes as its focus. In order to begin unpacking the imagery, in this chapter I undertake an analysis of a key element of Hardy's portrayal of farming, which pertains to what could be called its "humanitarian discourse". By this I mean a series of related ideas connected by a desire for the protection, dignity, and care of nonhumans. I use the word humanitarian because of its same usage in the Victorian period by members of animal rights organisations. The Humanitarian League was founded by Henry Salt in 1891 to advocate for the most pressing causes, namely working against the "ill-usage of the lower animals by mankind" (Salt in Hendrick 4). Consequently, Ritvo, in her analysis of Victorian animal discourses, describes humanitarians as those "sensitive to the suffering of animals" (134). The three Hardy novels demonstrate a humanitarian discourse, and more specifically a narrative exploration of the animal experience as perceived by the author. Farms are depicted in a way that deeply considers the treatment and position of the nonhuman. Moreover, a focus on the livestock animal as an empathetic part of the farming community highlights two diverging renderings within the novels: one where farming requires great care, and the other great brutality. The stunning complexity of Hardy's agriculture begins to be comprehensible, as even this one strand of the Wessex ontology produces two paradoxical points of view. The work of this chapter is to establish a reading lens which foregrounds humanitarian ethics, and to then demonstrate how the novels' repay this style of reading, illustrating their interest in lives of livestock.

In terms of structure, I begin the chapter by outlining the biographical information which supports the idea of Hardy the humanitarian, from personal letters to childhood anecdotes. This information is then collated into themes which underpin Hardy's compassionate feelings towards nonhumans. I use this knowledge to identify components

of farming's evocation from within the texts. This forms the second section of the chapter where I explore how the novels celebrate Wessex farms as places of interspecies community and welfare efforts, then pivot into unpacking how the narratives also depict farms facilitating violence to animals. As part of unpacking the texts in this way I also map the way narratives shift between reinforcing species distinctions between humans and animals and debunking these same distinctions, depending on the purpose and emphasis of a particular scene. This is a crucial technique within Hardy's humanitarian discourse. During my analysis I uncover the various other techniques Hardy uses to create these animal spaces, to encourage kinship towards animal beings, and to allow the reader to experience a type of nonhuman existence through human language.

### A Specific Type of Farming

Part of understanding agriculture's dual humanitarian identity is noting the type of farming Hardy references: that of 19<sup>th</sup> century Dorset. The author's contemporary conditions are largely characterised by pre-modern, traditional husbandry. It is the type of farming Bernard E. Rollin describes as "maximising animal interests" alongside human interests, a state he contrasts against modern industrial processes which typically reduce animal interests whenever profitable (88). Since in Hardy's farming, animal and human welfare is balanced to achieve a degree of positive outcomes for each, it is easy to recognise why Hardy's farms have been described by 21<sup>st</sup> century scholar Meadowsong as a "preindustrial Eden" which restores the characters to a "prelapsarian state" (237-8). Hardy's pastures and woolsheds exist within a wholly different industry to that of warehouses and cattle trucks. However, characterising Hardy's agriculture as untouched by modernity would be inaccurate. While the structures and practices that underpin Wessex agriculture are traditional in nature, there is also evidence of impending modernity and the implementation of certain industrial practices. For instance, in *Tess* a mechanical thresher is introduced to speed up the threshing process and shakes Tess so violently as she works upon it that she is thrown "into a stupefied reverie", and is barely aware of her surroundings (276). New experiences of agriculture for its labourers were the focus of Victorian debate as their industry changed dramatically (Ward). Sadie Ward maps

transformation occurring in rural Victorian Britain and emphasises the economic shift towards technology and industry. Jessica Martell similarly notes a “privileging [of] British industry over British agriculture” leading to “radical changes” for agriculturalists which centred on increased production (76). The changes are noted by Hardy, sometimes in his fiction and more often in his nonfiction writing (“The Dorsetshire Labourer”), and are part of the process of industrialisation and mass production of which factory farming is the end result. Hardy’s traditional farms are best understood as distinct from industrial versions of farming and yet wary of encroaching modernity and its ever more exploitative treatments of animals. Wessex farmyards are uniquely able to explore the paradoxes of farming’s care and butchery because of their shifting prioritizations of each. The novels explore the dual compassion and brutality because of the nature of this type of agriculture.

### Hardy’s Compassionate Biography

To begin the task of exploring Hardy’s compassionate feelings towards farm animals, there is a wide array of biographical material that demonstrates his concern for nonhumans. I have chosen a collection of communications, anecdotes, and secondary material which provide a clear and comprehensive idea of how Hardy conceived of the relationship between humans and nonhumans, and specifically about their welfare and protection. In the introduction to the thesis I quoted some often-referenced correspondence between Hardy and the Humanitarian League in which the author considers the implications of Darwinian science. It is worth returning to the letter here. The letter to the League congratulates the organisation on twenty years of sound work, while also expanding on the idea of broader altruism that Hardy had already expressed in a previous letter (West 1).

Hardy writes:

Few people seem to perceive fully as yet that the most far-reaching consequence of the establishment of the common origin of all species is ethical; that it logically involved a readjustment of altruistic morals, by enlarging, as a necessity of rightness, the application of what has been called “The Golden Rule” from the area of mere mankind to that of the whole animal kingdom. Possibly Darwin himself did not quite perceive it. While man was deemed to be a creation apart from all other creations, a

secondary or tertiary morality was considered good enough to practise towards the “inferior” races; but no person who reasons nowadays can escape the trying conclusion that this is not maintainable. (*Thomas Hardy’s Public Voice* 311)

The most stunning assertion Hardy makes is the relationship between humans and nonhumans that he sees evolutionary theory establish, specifically the equality this requires. The necessity of enacting egalitarian principles and universal altruism, regardless of species, is not represented as a potential possibility by the letter, but instead seen as entirely and invariably true. The statement is more forceful when viewed in Hardy’s context. Amongst those, like Hardy, who credited Darwin’s work there was disagreement about its significance and implications. For some the revelations about consanguinity spurred anxiety about a lack of human separateness or divinity (Ortiz-Robes, “Hardy’s Wessex” 90), and resultantly there was resistance against humans being “dethroned” from their position of primacy (Ritvo 39). In fact, despite the magnitude of Darwin’s findings even scientists such as Victorian naturalists altered their work only marginally in response (Ritvo 41). The implications of evolution were far from universally agreed upon. Hardy’s perspective aligned with more radical Victorian humanitarians, such as founder of The Humanitarian League Henry Salt whose “career developed concurrently with debates about the post-Darwinian” world (Stroup 5).

The strength of Hardy’s convictions about the impact of Darwinian science on animals is evidenced by the letter where his language strengthened by righteousness and quite probably frustration at its controversy. In expressing his point of view Hardy enlists the “Golden Rule” of Christian doctrine, specifically from the New Testament, which reads “do to others as you would have them do to you” (*Holy Bible: New Standard Revised Catholic Edition*. New Testament, Matt. 7.12). Hardy extends its application from its original and enshrined limits which positioned humanity as the masters of all other species, a radical suggestion in a society characterised and policed by biblical ideals. This of course speaks to Hardy’s intellectual and ideological clash with the church and growing impulse towards agnosticism, but even more profoundly his belief in restructuring the foundations of traditional British morality for the sake of greater compassion. For Hardy, Darwin’s science

and the sense of community it entailed shook the very structures of his society, his species, and a shared sense of common morality. Hardy signals the radicalism of his statement in acknowledging that it is still to be considered by the brightest Victorian minds, such as Darwin himself. In her reading of this letter, West emphasises the efforts Hardy went to in order to articulate his opinion on the subject, noting that the draft of the letter, written on a sheet of letter paper from the author's favourite London club, was "worked with lines and arrows, cancellations, word changes, and insertions" (1-2). Shared kinship, and its ethical implications, was a compelling imperative for the author and a concept he worked hard to explore intellectually and to explain linguistically.

The scientific revelation of shared origin reinforced an existing sense of kinship that Hardy experienced throughout his life on more physical and emotional levels. There are numerous biographical examples which exhibit moments of meaningful interaction between Hardy and animals. Perhaps one of the most moving is an anecdote from the author's childhood, when he found and picked up a dead bird, discovering it was as "light as a feather, all skin and bone, practically starved": a sensation that he remembered with unease right up until his final years (Hardy, *Life and Work* 479). The physical weight of the bird's body, held by Hardy's own hands, had a psychological and ontological impact on the author. As West eloquently puts it, "[i]n these moments of encounter and of contact, empathy is born" (151). Another similar story shows the same interest in animal bodies and lives. In this episode a young Hardy makes a game of crawling on all fours through a paddock and pretending to be a sheep (*Life and Work* 479). In imitating the sheep Hardy gets a glimpse of the world from a sheep-like perspective. This action is a physical manifestation of a talent Hardy displayed throughout his life, his "strange power of putting himself in the place of" others, particularly those who had "endured sufferings from which he himself had been in main free" (Florence Hardy, *The Personal Notebooks* 291-2). The young Hardy is keen to understand the sheep's lot. Hardy's second wife Florence notes of her husband that Hardy is keen to see how the sheep will react to his intrusion into their world, and finds them "gathered around in a close ring, gazing at him with astonished faces" (*Life and Work* 479). We find here that Hardy was invested not just in a childish game of acting, but in what the sheep might do and think about him, intrigued by their perceptions

and agency. While the game of imitating an animal is certainly not uncommon amongst children, what is particularly fascinating here is Hardy's interest in the life of a livestock animal, rather than a familiar domestic pet, or captivating wild species. Hardy's fascination with sheep, generally characterised as dumb and docile, illustrates a trans-species engagement with nonhumans that was not inhibited by typical spatial and conceptual boundaries of what was most human-like, most exotic, or most exciting. Hardy's life demonstrates a personal intrigue with all creatures, great and small.

Hardy's engagement with and speculation about a distinctly nonhuman experience of reality exemplifies a concept given form after his lifetime. The concept of perceiving unique animal worlds is articulated in the famous work of 20<sup>th</sup> century zoologist Jakob von Uexküll, and his coinage of the term *Umwelts*. Here von Uexküll draws reader attention to the world around them, stating that a human individual, as they perceive it, exists at the "center of a circular island that is covered by the blue vault of heaven" (107). Expanding upon this idea von Uexküll writes "the perceptible world that has been given to us... contains everything we can see. And the visible things are ordered according to their significance for our life" (107). This collection of experienceable things, or "island of senses" is the *Umwelt* (ibid). Crucially for von Uexküll, *Umwelts* are not stable and therefore neither are the objects under view either (108). Take for instance, a small insect, "with their smaller *Umwelt* horizons, the celestial bodies are essentially different. When mosquitoes dance in the sunset, they do not see our big human sun, setting six kilometers away, but small mosquito suns that set about half a meter away" (108). The *Umwelt* of an animal is specific to that species and individual, consisting of the central tenets of their existence, such as their prey, mates, and habitats. In this way the natural world is not one static habitat or space with stable meanings or contents but appears in innumerable variations to innumerable beings. In the following chapter, I explore how von Uexküll's almost poetic imagining of the mosquito's *Umwelt* is akin to Hardy's depiction of animal lives. Though it would be anachronistic to presume that Hardy's novels explore the idea of *Umwelts*, the concept of more-than-human environments and world views is uniquely relevant to Hardy's literature and a useful tool in exploring its depiction of farming. In deciphering relevant biographical material it becomes clear that Hardy's relationship with animals

prioritised feelings of kinship over alterity, revelling in the connections that could be built across species lines, while also perceiving that difference could produce interest rather than alienation. As Claire Tomalin writes in her award winning biography of the author, “From the start he felt a kinship with animals, and pity for their sufferings” (18). Hardy’s affiliations produced a genuine interest in the worlds of other species, a recognition of shared bodily experience, and deep empathy.

These feelings and inclinations found practical outlets in Hardy’s life and even death. As Kreilkamp asserts, it is certainly a truism to note Hardy’s interest in animals but “somewhat less well known is that he had an abiding concern for animals that expressed itself in numerous tangible ways” (*Minor Creatures* 118). He was horrified by the famous Smithfield Market, a livestock market located in central London where the treatment of animals was often rough (Tomalin 27), and in response Hardy left bequests to various charities dedicated to animal protection (Tomalin 376). He also gave testimony as the principal witness in a prosecution for the bad treatment of a cow in Dorchester (Sherman, “Lower Animals” 304). Hardy aligned himself with advancing humane slaughter practices by joining the Wessex Saddleback Pig society, and suggested that *The Animal’s Friend* (an animal rights group) publish a particularly didactic scene from *Jude* free of charge to help foster awareness about humane slaughter (Kreilkamp, *Minor Creatures* 118). Likewise, a small biography included in the *Who’s Who* of 1928 describes Hardy as a “Member of the Council of Justice to Animals; is against blood-sport, dog-chaining, and the caging of birds” (*Thomas Hardy’s Public Voice* 473). In many ways then Hardy embodied Victorian humanitarian efforts, exemplified through the choices he made and the causes he supported. It certainly follows that his literary work would likewise express the compassionate concern for animals, and particularly for working animals, that is demonstrated above. As Susan Keen argues in relation to the sheep paddock anecdote, Hardy sought to understand two questions of animals: “how do they feel?” and “how does it feel for me to feel with them?” (379). In the following I seek to illuminate how Hardy represented fictional animals being farmed, including the human and animal experience of this relationship, and equally how the text itself feels with animals and in doing so constructs a unique identity for animal farming.

## Humanitarian Hermeneutics - Care, Connection, and Community

One of the most striking and pervasive characteristics of Hardy's farms is their propensity to create multispecies communities, forged through care and connection. Significant within this theme is the pastoral role of farmers. All three of the novels in question (though to varying degrees) celebrate the way farmers care for, not just the survival, but the welfare of their animals. *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* shows a vivid example. While the milking process integral to the dairy herd in *Tess* is certainly based on economic incentives, it is also presented as having positive physical benefits for the cows. When we first meet Crick's dairy herd at Talbothays they walk with massive udders, pictured as "great bags of milk swinging under" (89), and "large-veined udders hung ponderous as sandbags" (90). An emphasis is placed on the extreme swelling and the abundance of milk their bodies are producing to create a sense of assumed relief at the milking. Additionally, throughout the milking scenes at Talbothays the cows' willingness is established. At Crick's dairy "in general the cows [are] milked when they present themselves" (102), and when cows are used to a milkmaid's hand, "the operation on their willing udders [is] surprisingly easy and effortless" (103). They are images of cooperation and ease. In one particular scene there is a striking sense of harmony between milcher and milker. As Tess milks her cow she is nearly perfectly still, "[n]othing in the picture [moving] but Old Pretty's tail and Tess's pink hands, the latter so gently as to be a rhythmic pulsation only, as if they were obeying a reflex stimulus, like a beating heart" (116). Their subtle movements become symbiotic. The human-animal hybrid Tess and the cow make is reminiscent of the composite creature Ivan Kreilkamp notes in *Madding Crowd* when Gabriel enters Warren's Malthouse carrying newborn lambs, their limbs possibly belonging to one complete being (Kreilkamp, 'Pitying' 477; *FFMC* 84). Tess' hands are simply one of the cow's organs as integral as its heart. Here cows cooperate with, even merge with, humans to ease the innate difficulties of bovine life.

Even more significantly, at times Wessex animal lives are not only made less gruelling by the care of agriculturalists but, perhaps rather ironically, preserved and lengthened. Early in his employ with Bathsheba, Gabriel is out lambing in late winter. One

morning he stumbles into the village Malthouse with lambs draped across his shoulders “in various embarrassing attitudes” (*Madding Crowd* 85). Inside, he takes the small bodies, covers them in hay, and places them around the fire (85). After some time the warmth begins to “stimulate the nearly lifeless lambs” and now conscious, Gabriel can teach “those of the helpless creatures which were not to be restored to their dams how to drink” from a teapot filled with milk (88). The blurring of species boundaries—and also gender boundaries (Shires, “Narrative, Gender and Power” 163)—enacted in this scene serves to emphasise the motherly role Gabriel takes on as the lambs’ guardian; both the sheep and Gabriel embody roles beyond their normative state (Kreilkamp, “Pitying the Sheep” 476). The lambs are situated inside out of the snow, huddled around the human fire, and drinking from a human instrument, one generally reserved for tea. The harsh conditions illustrate both the sheep’s desperate need for some remedial warmth but also Gabriel’s heroic actions in persevering through the elements to their aid. The difficult nature of winter lambing, especially in bad weather, is established early in the episode when Poorgrass asks Gabriel about the current season. Gabriel responds “Terrible trying... I’ve been wet through twice a-day, either in snow or rain, this last fortnight. Cainy and I haven’t tined [shut] our eyes tonight” (85). In portraying the lambs as helpless, the external conditions as brutal, and the actions of Gabriel as their salvation, it becomes implicit that had the sheep been left out in the fields alone they would certainly have died. In this sense the life of an agricultural animal is more privileged than that of a wild animal. In another telling episode Gabriel saves the lives of sheep who have become ill from eating some poisonous vegetation. In exasperation Bathsheba declares “Sheep are such unfortunate animals... I never knew a flock to pass a year without getting into some scrape or another” (108). The recklessness of the flock is contrasted with the determined care of their shepherds, and it is that care that ensures the flock’s very survival. In *Madding Crowd* the agriculturalist’s intervention in animal lives is fortunate and restorative.

These portrayals of Gabriel’s shepherding and Tess’s milking demonstrate the benevolent power that agriculturalists wield over creatures’ lives. A crucial concept in unpacking these benevolent interspecies relationships on Hardy’s farms is pastoral power. Michel Foucault elucidated the concept of ‘pastoral power’ as part of his broader

exploration of the power dynamics exercised within modernity. Foucault understood pastoral power thus:

The essential objective of pastoral power is the salvation of the flock... Pastoral power is a power of care. It looks after the flock, it looks after the individuals of the flock, it sees to it that the sheep do not suffer, it goes in search of those who have strayed off course, and it treats those that are injured. The shepherd is someone who... will see to it that things are best for each of the animals in his flock. (126-7)

Foucault argues that the emergence of this form of power is one of the basic elements of Western modernity (Kreilkamp, "Pitying" 475). Interestingly, though Foucault uses interspecies relations as the basis for this analogy, animals were never a focus of his thinking (Fudge, "Left-Handed Blow" 14, Taylor 539). However, as Kreilkamp reminds us, the analogy of the phrase, though figurative, is firmly centred on the actual role of shepherds (Kreilkamp, "Pitying the Sheep" 475), and because of work's applicability to human-animal relations and particularly livestock, much of Animal Studies research mobilises Foucault to gain clarity on the dynamics involved in interspecies relationships (Taylor 539). Crucially in relation to Hardy's work, pastoral power as a dynamic is characterised by care and protection—it is "mindfully benevolent" (Taylor 548)—and therefore is not necessarily oppressive but instead desires to be constructive. It is worth noting that some scholars of Animal Studies have rejected pastoral power as a framework for understanding livestock farming because in their view the animal's position is one of inescapable doom and so not a site of power relations but rather blatant oppression (Cole 88). This is perhaps more and more evident as farming methods shift towards utter mechanisation and away from interspecies bonds. Nonetheless, pastoral power underpins much of Hardy's pre-industrial farmyards and is certainly a characteristic of their identity in the Wessex world, to the point that the farmers and their flocks are almost an embodiment of the original allegory.

*Madding Crowd* is particularly apt for a reading of these relationship dynamics. In fact, Kreilkamp sees the novel as an extended exploration of the pastoral power dynamic of shepherding ("Pitying the Sheep" 475). The treatment that Gabriel and the other rustics

show their sheep enacts a relationship which extends well beyond “domination” and embodies genuine safety (ibid). Ortiz-Robles also considers pastoral power in the novel, and much like Kreilkamp, particularly notes the blurring of species boundaries between the men and the sheep (“Hardy’s Wessex” 90). This can be read as part of the legacy of Darwinism (Ortiz-Robles, “Hardy’s Wessex” 90); a manifestation of the modern feeling that all creatures belong to the same wider biological family. The meticulous protecting and counting of bodies in the novel depicts pastoral power in action (ibid). Foucault himself positions the counting of sheep as fundamental to the shepherd's work, as this allows the shepherd to account for and protect each of the individual members of the flock (128). The action speaks to both the financial but also emotional importance of the sheep to the shepherd. This same focus on counting is illustrated in Hardy’s shearing and blasting scenes in *Madding Crowd* (Ortiz-Robles, “Hardy’s Wessex” 92). Bodies are carefully accumulated into safe and correct spaces. The novel works as a testament then to the success and protective efforts of pastoral power dynamics. This framing of human-ovine interactions is so captivating it has a persuasive quality and “teaches its readers, too, to pity the sheep” (Kreilkamp, “Pitying” 475). The humanitarian nature of Gabriel’s ministrations to his flock have the power to influence human perceptions of animal experiences and their treatment. The ideal of pastoral power, with both its long history in Judeo-Christian culture and its new meanings at the brink of modernity, is fundamental to Hardy’s approving portrayal of animal farming.

A key theme of the farmer’s pastoral power concept in Hardy’s fiction is the species distinction made between the objects of care and the carers. This distinction proclaims the human as responsible for the guardianship of the other. Understanding the way this particular human-animal barrier is used in Hardy is central to grasping his novelistic treatment of animals in general and also of livestock. While barriers are often fluid in his work, particularly species barriers, at times these become more rigid in order to enact his humanitarian agenda. Human agency and responsibility to nonhumans is something Elisha Cohn highlights in her analysis of Hardy’s narrative treatment of animals. She does not use her approach to analyse farm animals as a group unto themselves and useful work can be done in extending her research outwards into the agricultural domain. In her article “No

Insignificant Creature': Thomas Hardy's Ethical Turn" Cohn posits a chronological development through Hardy's fiction in terms of his ontological perception of human-animal relationships. She argues that this develops from the discourse of 'becoming', where human-nonhuman consanguinity is emphasised, to the discourse of the 'creature' which differentiates more strongly between the human and nonhuman in order to emphasise uniquely human agency (509). Ultimately her work demonstrates that Hardy's desire to advocate against animal suffering required a shifted narrative infrastructure to incorporate species divisions and thus to amplify the human propensity for altruism. Only when humans are conceived as different from animals can they be their protectors.

Equally, fluidity between species is also a fundamental part of the positive welfare that Hardy depicts occurring on his farms. Connection that transcends alterity is key to the kindly farmer. But if the farmer is caring, life-giving, and custodial, as Hardy's novels so often suggest, it could be argued that these behaviours are simply inherent to the agriculturalist's role, forged by an understanding that these animals represent livelihoods and job stability. However, this simplification ignores the very real relationships that farmers develop with their nonhuman animals in Hardy. The final point I wish to make in this section of the chapter puts forward the way Wessex agriculturalists recognise individual creatures from within their herds and form interspecies relationships with them, suggesting that farms—whilst undeniably commercial endeavours—are also spaces of human-nonhuman communication and kinship. The propensity of agriculturalists to connect and form relationships with their animals is something some scholars have noted. Lewis Holloway argues that farms, and the interspecies interactions they require, can encourage the recognition of animal subjectivity (1041). Farmers in close contact with their animals note their likes and dislikes, social bonds, and individual temperaments (Holloway, Seabrook). Farmers are in a position to witness what Derrida termed "unsubstitutable singularity" (9), to notice the ways in which individual animals, much like individual humans, are unique and unrepeatable.

This is certainly true in *Tess*. The milchers are named, and these names are used by both the characters and the narrator to mark them out from one another. The individuality of the creatures is further expressed through their unique preferences. A kind of pantomime is described when, not long after Tess had begun working at the dairy, the competing desires of farmer Crick and his milchers are enacted. While “certain cows will show a fondness for a particular pair of hands, sometimes carrying this predilection so far as to refuse to stand at all except for their favourite” (102-3), Crick “insist[s] on breaking down these partialities and aversions by constant interchange” (103). Adding to the humorous manoeuvres, the dairy maids also have “private aims” to always milk the cows which like them most, making their job nearly effortless (103). In this tangle of competing objectives, it becomes clear that the cows have distinct identities, unique preferences, and a kind of agency. In their uniqueness and sentience they are able to form bonds with humans. Moreover, while the kinship between Tess and the creaturely life has long been a popular topic of discussion (Meadowsong 230), Tess’s relationship with the dairy cows has not yet been read with the purpose of understanding more about animal farming as I seek to do. The sharing of meaning between them, in which Tess shapes the identity of the cows and the cows shape the identity of Tess is an important revelation. The mutual meaning-making of their relationship is embodied in a motif which features in the novel and has yet to receive critical mention. In this example the species boundaries between woman and cow, which both separate the two and infer species-based assumptions about their identities, are broken down and reinvented to create a space where each reflects and draws upon the other. This work hinges on the imagery of a cameo. When the reader is first becoming acquainted with the dairy cows the narrator directs attention to their outline and the silhouette thrown on the wall by the sun. The sun throws these shadows “with as much care over each contour as if it had been the profile of a Court beauty on a palace wall,” (89-90) the simile eliding for a moment the human-animal divide. The silhouetted image of the cows’ shadows is drawn upon once again later in the novel. In a significant scene Tess is out milking in the mead and Angel observes her. The milkmaid rests the side of her head on the flank of the cow and looks out across the meadow. The sun shines “flat upon her . . . and upon her profile, rendering it keen as a cameo cut from the dun background of the cow” (116). While in the first instance the cow’s shape is marked on a human structure, in this

later scene a human's shape is marked upon the cow. The sun treats their bodies indiscriminately, making art of them, and in fact in the act of milking their bodies almost become one. An intimacy is founded and expressed in their shared physicality. It is a staggering image of connection, co-creation, and kinship.

Moreover, this kinship between human and animal is not solely the territory of the female farmer. A similar closeness occurs between Gabriel and his sheep. This is evidenced in the scene where Gabriel first encounters Fanny Robin. Gabriel offers Fanny some money and as they reach out to each other in the gloom of the night Gabriel accidentally touches the woman's wrist. He notices her heart "beating with a throb of tragic intensity" (44) and recognises its familiarity. He has "felt the same quick, hard beat in the femoral artery of his lambs" (44). When he touches the skin of a human and feels a human heartbeat his first association is with that of sheep. It makes a point about Fanny's flightiness and vulnerability, her "consumption too great of a vitality" (44), but also Gabriel's bodily connection with his flock. As Kreilkamp puts it, here Hardy is "'creaturing' the human" - bringing both the human and nonhuman into the shared broader category of animal ("Pitying" 477). The species-blurring enacted by farming rejects barriers between human and nonhuman life and establishes their corporeal similarities. The pig-killing scene from *Jude*, which is crucial to this research and will be explored in greater detail later in the thesis, is a scene in which human culture and animal bodies clash violently. Yet even here the physical similarities between human and animal are emphasised. In the narrator's description of the event attention is drawn to the physiognomy shared between the humans and the pig, such as the lips (Keen 376). It is the pig's expressions and its evident cries of agony that are so disturbing (*Jude* 54). From human-nonhuman interactions comes understanding, revelation of affinity, broaching of alterity, and even interspecies friendship.

The way that Hardy depicts his nonhuman characters is famously recognised by Henry James in a scathing review he gave of *Madding Crowd*. James writes "[e]verything human in the books strikes us as factitious and insubstantial; the only things we believe in are the sheep and the dogs" (368). Though inevitably meant to criticise the novel, James' comment indicates the narrative's impressive skill in rendering its nonhuman characters.

They are unique, tangible, befrienable. Their identities within Hardy's novels, as almost characters of their own, is a shocking inclusion for a novel of the period (Kreilkamp, "Minor Creatures") and demonstrates what Cohn calls Hardy's "deeply anti-humanist commitments" (500). In considering these collected scenes from the novels, there is a kind of simultaneous individualisation and homogenisation at play. The characterisation of humans and nonhumans alike involves recognition of alterity, diversity, and the allocation of names, and yet all these beings are figured as part of the same larger herd or family, sharing in the lived experience of being an animal. On Hardy's farms subjectivity produces connection, and connection creates community.

### Humanitarian Hermeneutics - Brutality, Butchery, and Body Parts

It is tempting then, given the care, protection, connection and community of Wessex farmyards, to view farming in general as a site of bucolic pastoralism. However, this is not, of course, always the case. Existing alongside these more idyllic renditions of farming are illustrations which instead emphasise the exploitation and violent actions required or necessitated by the industry. This is the second discourse of Hardy's humanitarian endeavour made manifest in his farms. In the following section I first look to relevant scholarship regarding how empathy functions in Hardy in order to position myself among these scholars and extend their work onto the new ground of the farmyard, arguing that expressions of empathy are key to the novels' more brutal depictions of farming and their ethical aims. After establishing my approach I demonstrate how the novels expose the brutality of butchery, the precarious and dangerous position of the livestock animal, their identity as chattel, and the welfare issues raised in farming environments.

A concept crucial to the critical humanitarian discourse framing farming is empathy. Through connecting empathetically, the human reader has the potential to experience the violence enacted upon animals as if it were enacted upon themselves. Empathy as a concept first emerged during Hardy's era, having developed from the German concept '*Einfuhling*' or 'feeling into' (Keen 350). Hardy wrote his fiction whilst Victorian psychologists were in the process of considering our capacity for affective responses (Keen 352). Primary to

empathy's elucidation during the period was bodily feeling, it being a state originally understood as a matter of "unconscious physiological reaction" (Morgan 32). This differentiated empathy from sympathy, which was a more cerebral experience and according to D. R. Greiner was, and perhaps still is, perceived as empathy's "poorer cousin" (Greiner 418). Moreover, empathy's visceral impact was considered by Victorians to be part of the reading experience, Benjamin Morgan exploring for example the way "Victorians read books with their bodies" (31). Hardy's work encourages just this kind of experience, and this is particularly true in relation to livestock. When thinking about empathy in Hardy, Suzanne Keen's article "Empathetic Hardy: Bounded, Ambassadorial, and Broadcast Strategies of Empathy" is a key source. While Keen is quick to point out that the author never actually uses the word 'empathy' in his published works, there is certainly evidence that he was aware of discourses which surrounded the idea of empathy and often used related words including "lovingkindness, fellow-feeling, and most importantly altruism" which Keen sees as demonstrating his "parallel interests" in empathetic feeling (357). While her argument draws on the author's creation of empathy for all life, and even lifeless objects, her approach is effective in thinking about livestock animals. Hardy's ability to connect with the physical and emotional experiences of other beings is the basis of his empathic tendencies, his humanitarian instincts, and thus his depiction of farming. This ability becomes particularly poignant in the bleaker depictions that are to follow. As the author himself writes "'Altruism, or the Golden Rule, or whatever 'Love your Neighbour as Yourself' may be called, will ultimately be brought about... by the pain we see in other reacting on ourselves, as if we and they were part of one body" (Hardy quoted in Millgate, *Life and Work* 235).

I argue, building from Keen, that Hardy's depiction of livestock and their perils exemplifies his transspecies empathetic capabilities. In this way his work extends past what scholars have previously labelled sympathy. Caroline Sumpter argues that Hardy's fiction, and particularly *Jude*, is illuminated by understanding the way Hardy's sympathy, his belief in Darwinian science, and evolutionary meliorism work together to offer an elusive but visible sense of optimism for future generations. She argues that through witnessing and pitying the suffering of other bodies, Hardy hopes that humans will gradually evolve

towards avoiding all suffering entirely (684). I similarly posit that this desire towards egalitarianism through documenting suffering is one element of the complex rendering of the farm that exists in the novels, but diverge from Sumpter to position Hardy's narrative relationship to nonhumans not as sympathy but a deeper and more physiological kind of empathy which extends to the bodies of livestock. In terms of Wessex agriculture, I argue that this pervasive discourse of the suffering farm animal which runs throughout the novels is a key component to understanding the partially humanitarian identity of Wessex agriculture.

The most infamous example of the provocation of empathy is the pig-killing scene from *Jude* which depicts the abject horror of Victorian butchery practices. The scene is framed through the perceptions of Jude; a character with whom the reader is encouraged to empathise from the outset of the narrative. This encouragement of reader empathy for Jude, according to Keen, fits within a strategic narrative empathy structure she terms ambassadorial empathy, which "attempts to move more distant others on behalf of those represented empathetically" (365). This particularly strategy, in contrast to bounded and broadcast strategies, represents "members of despised groups and animals, especially horses, dogs, and sheep" (Keen 365), and seeks "the empathy of targeted others for needy strangers, or for the disenfranchised, despised, or the misunderstood among us" (370). This description from Keen is particularly useful in understanding both Jude's position within the text, as he makes choices which ostracise him from polite society and he therefore becomes ever more despised and disempowered, but also, importantly, the position of the pig who was always innately those things. The pig-killing scene presents Jude and his livestock animal as victims of their disenfranchised situation and draws on the process of butchery in doing so. The first twinges of apprehension appear as Jude prepares the hot water to scald the pig's hairs from its skin (54), and this feeling is worsened by his hearing of the pig's noises, and even more so by Arabella's revelation that she has starved the pig to make the butchering easier, which accounts for its screaming (55). Almost as soon as the scene begins Jude resists doing what pig slaughtering requires. Arabella insists that they must cut the pig without killing it to let it slowly bleed out as this will allow the meat to fetch a higher price but Jude counters that "He shall not be half a minute if I can help it,

however the meat may look” (56). He plunges the knife in hard and kills the creature. The calculated killing that standard butchering practice requires is traumatic to Jude, leading to his own violent attack on the pig himself. Both beings become objects of pity, killer and killed, as if farming practice itself is the true evil.

If Jude’s experience of the slaughter is not enough to suggest the grisly nature of the scene, the striking images scattered throughout certainly make Hardy’s perception of the practice clear. This is the only scene in the four novels which describes the slaughter of an animal, and the narrator of *Jude* does so in vivid, emotive detail. Examples of this include the dying pig’s “shriek of agony” (56), its blood flowing “out in a torrent” (56), staining the “white snow” (57), and the images of the animal’s “final convulsion” which sends “a tablespoon of black clot coming forth” (56). In the chaos of the killing Jude kicks over the bucket of pig’s blood Arabella had saved for black pudding, and it splashes over the snow “forming a dismal, sordid, ugly spectacle” (56). The description of this particular moment seems apt for describing the entire pig-killing. The language of the scene is unforgiving. Anna West reads the event as Hardy forcing the reader to watch the gory details of an act unwitnessed by the majority of society, and that the most tangible distress and tension of the episode is borne of Arabella’s own discomfort at the pig’s pain (134). As the pig begins to cry out and look upon its killers in accusation, Arabella takes the knife to its throat to silence it (*Jude* 56). Even the most seasoned of pig farmers is agitated by the agonised gaze of the animal. Here the novel seems to shame the reader into a state of empathy, as if to watch the affair unfeelingly would display an even greater detachment than Arabella’s already questionable disposition. Moreover, the scene seems written to address the words of Leslie Stephen, a prominent Victorian writer and one of Hardy’s editors, when he states “The pig has a stronger interest than any one in the demand for bacon... He has to pay for his privileges by an early death; but he makes a good bargain of it” (Stephen 86). As Sumpter accurately notes “*Jude the Obscure* hardly endorses Stephen’s cheerful subordination of animals to human needs” (670). The intended impact of the scene is articulated by Hardy in his correspondence when he offers the scene to The Animals’ Friend (an animal rights organisation) for print, in order to inspire more compassionate slaughter of pigs (*Collected Letters* II 97). This episode is the most blatant example of violence

enacted upon the animal in the three novels, and gives a glimpse of Hardy at his most adamant and painfully empathetic. It forces the reader to experience viscerally the fate that awaits all livestock.

There is also a gendered, anthropomorphic element to the empathy Hardy encourages for exploited livestock. Female characters and nonhuman characters are often allied in their pitiful experiences at the hands of the human. In her article “‘The Distance Between Them’: Sheep, Women and Violence in Evie Wyld’s *All the Birds, Singing* and Barbara Baynton’s *Bush Studies*” Lucy Neave considers the conflation and distancing of women and sheep in Australian literature of the bush. She notes the shared bodily experience that connects a particular female protagonist with her sheep, the character “acknowledging a shared physicality” (133) with the ovine form. A similar process is notable in the Wessex world. West argues that in *Tess* the heroine’s reaction to animal suffering is most often bodily and physical. West explains that:

[t]hese reactions suggest a dynamic in the text... that in some ways exceeds or evades linguistic representation: her responses occur on a basic level of shared embodiment that cannot be articulated in conceptual language, that focuses instead on the materiality of existence. (151)

The silhouette motif I previously identified further illuminates the point. The corporeal connection between Tess and her cows makes fluid the boundaries between humans and animals and encourages the reader’s empathy for all living things. Tess is connected with nature particularly in relation to her femininity and fertility. As Martell shows, part of Talbothays’ characterisation in the novel is its potent fertility and lactation. I would argue that these associations are easily connected with Tess’ experience of motherhood, and her scenes of outdoor milking hark back to breastfeeding her infant Sorrow in the open field where she works as a labourer (78). Talbothays makes constant allusions to maternity, and the past which she cannot escape. A scene out milking seems to allude quite deliberately to her traumatic past when Angel boldly embraces Tess. The cow Tess has been milking, Old Pretty, looks round towards them, and “seeing two people crouching under her where, by immemorial custom, there should have been only one” she stamps her leg in irritation (117). While on a literal level the cow is disturbed by the

changes to normal milking practice, the phrase also alludes to the two men in Tess' life, their duality the source of much conflict in the text. When Angel professes his affection in their embrace, there becomes two men where there should have been one. It is appropriate that a dairy farm serves as the location for Tess' realisation that she cannot leave her past, or her motherhood, behind. This conflation of female characters and female farm animals is similarly evident in *Far from the Madding Crowd* where the heroine Bathsheba gains her name from the biblical parable of the ewe lamb, Kreilkamp arguing that in both the biblical passage and Hardy's novel the ewe lamb "becomes an embodiment of a fragile nonhuman subjectivity within an anthropocentric society" ("Pitying" 480). Hardy connects these female protagonists with female livestock and, crucially, in doing so the suffering of each is shared and amplified.

Another principal part of the farm animals' bleak fate which the text dramatises is their reduction to objects and parts. The knowledge of animals eventually being sent off to slaughter, and morphing from individuals into chattel, is particularly strong in scenes set at fairs or markets. Towards the end of *Madding Crowd* Bathsheba's flock is driven to a market where they are to be sold for meat. The human experience of the market is jovial and festive. When shepherds are arriving at the fair's destination, with their flocks, the novel describes the kinds of sheep and the general procession. It is clear that Hardy takes real enjoyment here in listing and describing the kinds of sheep, and their differentiating characteristics. While there is certainly a tone of celebration in the scene, the language used also assumes the perspective of the sheep. The "slow procession" of livestock has had a long journey, and the animals bleat "piteously at the unwontedness of their experiences" (258). Despite the men shouting and dogs barking, they have "grown nearly indifferent to such terrors" because of such a long exposure to them (258). This description of the arriving crowd is completed with an image of a tall shepherd surrounded by the smaller bodies, whom the novel describes as "a gigantic idol amid a crowd of prostrate devotees" (258). The feeling this accumulation of images creates is of the sheep's helplessness, distress, weariness, and utter submission. Here the reader glimpses a different angle on pastoral power. Though the reader is not privy to the sheep's sale or butchering, an impression is given of the animals' new condition, as objects of profit.

The objectification and de-individualisation agriculture enacts on its nonhuman creatures is particularly prevalent in *Jude*. The pig-killing scene is an example of this, but the breaking down of the pig into its body parts is reminiscent of the first encounter between Jude and Arabella. As Jude walks along a country lane, consumed by his own thoughts, he recoils when a “soft cold substance” hits him sharply on the ear (34). When he looks down at the object he recognises the projectile as “a piece of flesh, the characteristic part of a barrow-pig” (34), in other words, a pig’s phallus. In response, Jude looks over a nearby hedge to determine who has thrown it, and sees a group of three women washing pig intestines in a stream (34). It becomes apparent that the object was thrown to attract Jude’s attention, and he goes over to speak to the workers, striking up a conversation with one woman who will later become his wife. The allusions of the scene are clear, and it foreshadows the sexual interest and relationship that will develop between the two characters. Dale Kramer maps the bowdlerisation the novel underwent for serialisation, and looks specifically at this scene. Kramer notes that during the editing process Hardy made less of the object thrown at Jude, to reduce its explicitness (167). The image is certainly scandalous, given the Victorian audience for which Hardy was writing, but the origin of the uneasiness it evokes is at least twofold. On the one hand the object is disturbing because it represents an anatomy and sexuality that is taboo in polite conversation, but also there is a sense that the flinging of the pig’s phallus, coupled with the cleaning of the pig intestines, marks out how detached the body parts have become from the creature that once owned them. When viewed from this perspective the pig body parts enter the realm of the uncanny. The way the women treat the pig’s organ, as an object of entertainment, juxtaposes quite drastically with scenes where humans name and befriend their animals. Though the episode dramatises an extreme and strange use of an animal part, it also enacts the very standard process of breaking apart the animal into sections which is necessary for any kind of butchery whether it be one of Crick’s old heifers, or Bathsheba’s lambs. In fact, Ivan Kreilkamp demonstrates that this disturbing “deindividuating process” is explored within *Madding Crowd*, when Gabriel’s sheep are chased off a cliff (“Pitying the Sheep” 478). The ewes become matter (479), in the same way

livestock become the butcher's stock. Whatever kind of life a farm animal may live, the novels emphasise that one day it will become merely a chop, or steak, or mutton.

While the inevitable trip to market is an obvious example of how Wessex agriculture must eventually disregard animal welfare and view animals as commodities, some of Hardy's farm animals also experience this kind of treatment during their lifetimes. The subtle suggestion of this appears in a surprising place. The aforementioned dairy herd at Talbothays, featured in *Tess*, in some ways demonstrates a kind of idyllic pastoralism. The scenes at Crick's dairy are, for Tess especially, almost Edenic, as she exists amongst nature, falls in love with Angel, and listens to his soothing harp. However, though idealised, Talbothays is never entirely idyllic and a close reading reveals hints of the disturbing aspects of Victorian dairy life. In her article "The Dorset Dairy, the Pastoral, and Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*" Jessica Martell considers the novel's pastoralism, arguing that *Tess* demonstrates a complex, self-conscious style, which admits into its representation the impacts of industrialization on the dairy industry. Crick's dairy, although situated in rural Dorset, supplies the capital with milk through the new railway transport system. Martell shows that the "industrialized husbandry," which dairyman Crick invites into his dairying through the railway, demands milk in extreme supply for the urban population, leaving nature unable to continue its normal rhythms (73). According to Martell, the "natural logic of renewal is overwritten by an industrial logic of expansion" (73). As a visual metaphor of this over-exploitation of nature, industrial milk production "oozes its way into the symbolic territory of the pastoral ecosystem" of the novel, in the form of literally oozing milk and dairy products (Martell 74). For instance, when Tess first arrives at the place of her new employer it is described as: "the Valley of the Great Dairies, the valley in which milk and butter grew to rankness, and were produced more profusely, if less delicately, than at her home" (86). The products of the cows are distinguished by their extreme production in comparison to other more reasonable, modest practices. Hardy employs the language of mass production. The Var Vale where the dairy sits is a nauseating place of "oozing fatness and warm ferments" (*Tess* 115). In this context, the aforementioned image of the swollen udders represents overburden and even exploitation, the cows so full of liquid they become disturbingly sexualised. Martell posits that oozing milk is overlaid with metaphors of the

lurid reproduction and extreme fertility required of industrialised farming (84). The dairy's cycles of reproduction are as "violent" and "urgent" as the sexual attack of Alec d'Urberville (Martell 83). In this light, Talbothays' farming is not idyllic but ruthless and relentless. It is significant too that Talbothays, such a model example of agriculture and enacted by such likeable characters, including the almost infallible Tess (Shires, "The Radical Aesthetic" 151), should embed within it a kind of exploitation and disregard for welfare.

The three novels supply images of exploitation and brutality towards livestock, in their butchery, their use as objects, the precariousness of their lives, and their callous usage for financial benefit. Certain narrative techniques highlight to the reader the humanitarian issues associated with animal agriculture, such as a deep empathy with the experiences of animal bodies, shared physicality, grisly imagery, the juxtaposition of care and harm, accumulated scenes of submission, and striking, if subtle, metaphors of mistreatment. Held up against the prior images of pastoral care and community there is an undeniable clash of narrative realities. It is worth noting here that the realities of farming, both in general and of Victorian farms in rural Dorset, involved the combination of care and harm, due to the very demands of the industry. Animal agriculture is built on the process of rearing an animal for the sake of its slaughter. One might argue then that it was inevitable that the innate contradictions of the industry would manifest themselves in representations of agriculture. However, in answer to that supposition and to quote Hardy himself, I posit that authors create their own worlds and in doing so enact "a disproportioning... of realities" (*Life and Work* 239). Hardy could certainly have elided or excluded aspects of farming that did not suit his ontology or themes. It would have been possible to avoid articulating Gabriel's betrayal, or the over-swollen udders of Crick's milchers, and similarly possible to diminish the connection between the pig and his companions-come-killers, Jude and Arabella. These clashes between ideals of care and exposures of brutality are significant in their inclusion, and that choice itself is fascinating in terms of understanding Hardy's depictions of animals.

## Conclusion

Through the progress of the analysis above it becomes clear that while farming ensures the survival, protection, and preservation of life, it also elicits suffering and ultimately death. I have shown that while Wessex farms create interspecies communities built on recognition of individuality, agriculture in Hardy's era already requires objectification and dismemberment which turns beings into mere matter. The mutiny of such an industry is highlighted by the three novels in numerous obvious and subtle moves. The relationship between shepherd and flock, dairymaid and dairyherd, pig owner and pig killer, shifts often to the point of instability. The farmer is at once a protector and a betrayer, the farm animal is both a unique being and unindividuated meat. The two disparate perspectives explored above are united in their desire to advance a humanitarian agenda, grounded in the ability to feel empathy with the nonhuman and desire for their good welfare. Recognising how Hardy's humanitarianism functions in the farmyard is central to untangling the author's complex agricultural industry. It is not, however, the only discourse at work and in my next chapter I tackle another concept central to understanding Wessex farming: the author's utilitarian logic.

## Chapter Three: Hardy the Utilitarian

Chapter Two's positioning of humanitarianism as a pervasive discourse in Hardy's depiction of farming creates a sense of both the author and of the texts as deeply invested in animal welfare. And while that second chapter seeks to demonstrate compelling biographical and most importantly textual evidence for Hardy's humanitarianism, this third chapter turns in a different, and even antithetical direction. By looking once again to what I have called the kaleidoscopic image of farming in the texts, in this chapter I draw out what I argue is the second predominant discourse which structures animal agriculture: utilitarian thinking. In the following I seek to understand the influential role that utilitarian inclinations and ethics play in Hardy's perception of animals and thus the depiction of Wessex farming. I begin by outlining the term utilitarian, to expand upon two relevant meanings at hand, one a more straightforward concern with utility and the other a philosophical system of ethics. I then explore the expressions of these two strands of the term in various biographical materials in order to demonstrate how they played out in Hardy's life. In the final and largest section of the chapter this twofold utilitarianism is explored in terms of its manifestations in the novels.

I argue that Hardy's novels portray the substantial usefulness of animal bodies to the rural community, both in an economic sense, but also in an emotive fashion, positioning traditional animal husbandry as central to a rustic culture spanning millennia. Moreover, because animal bodies are so useful and fundamental to rural life, the possibility of choosing not to use them becomes incredibly complicated. I posit that the novels enact a calculated balancing of interests—those of the human and nonhuman farm animal—to consider the possibilities of altruism in relation to livestock, what the consequences of that might be, and which actions might actually achieve the most good. This culminates in a pervasive motif which dichotomises altruistic behaviours and pragmatic choices. In this motif utilitarian choices which favour pragmatism are the key to survival and compassion is ruin for its actor. I finish by exploring how Hardy's novels, and particularly *Jude*, engage in contemporary scientific debate concerning altruism's limitations and even futility. *Madding Crowd*, *Tess* and *Jude* depict a universe in which usefulness is a defining feature of the farm

animal and thus careful, realistic choices must be made about their treatment, acknowledging the real possibility that humanitarianism is likely ruinous. In this light farms are fundamental institutions and their exploitation of animals is the only logical and reliable way to secure human livelihoods, welfare, and rustic culture, areas in which Hardy is deeply invested. Highlighting this utilitarian hue is essential to understanding Hardy's representations of animals and agriculture.

### On Utilitarianism: A Salvation and a Sentence

Firstly, to set out what I mean by the term 'utilitarian' itself, on a foundational level utilitarian ideas are about utility. This component of the concept focuses on materials and aims which achieve useful outcomes. Secondly, utilitarianism is also characterised on another level as a more complex ethical position. In philosophical spaces utilitarianism is best understood as the "ethical doctrine that holds that the right conduct consists in doing whatever will maximise the well-being of everyone affected by an action" (Danielson 425). Utilitarian positions in this sense are outcomes-based, and seek the best outcomes for the largest number. Both of these definitions are relevant to Hardy's depictions of farm animals. Since the desire towards utility connects in a fairly straightforward way to animal issues—those who seek utility will recognise the benefits of using animals—it is more important here to give further investigation to the ethical debates which centre around the term utilitarian as it relates to animals. There are clear reasons why utilitarian philosophy is well suited to thinking about animals, namely in its desire to achieve the wellbeing of the largest number possible. This way of thinking naturally expands consideration out to the nonhuman. In fact, according to R. G. Frey—writer of a chapter devoted to utilitarianism in *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Ethics*—"of all the traditional, mainstream ethical theories, none has been more disposed over the centuries to sympathetic consideration of the pains of animals than utilitarianism" (173). Thus utilitarianism has been forefront in ethical discussions of animals for the last century and a half (Frey 175). The founding voice of this discussion is Jeremy Bentham, an 18<sup>th</sup> century British philosopher. Bentham posited that while there were certainly evident differences between humans and nonhumans there were

also shared traits, and he saw the most relevant among these as the ability to experience sentience (Frey 174). This important capacity, referred to as the “sentience criterion”, is a key component of utilitarian positions on animal ethics.

The sentience criterion was later explored in detail by Australian philosopher Peter Singer in *Animal Liberation*. Here Singer argued, as I reference in my introduction to this thesis, that “[i]f a being suffers there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideration” (33). In Singer’s monograph the essentials of utilitarian views on animals take comprehensive form. In his assessment of the modern treatment of nonhumans, including chapters about industrialised farming and scientific testing on animals, Singer objects to the imbalance and essentially exploitative nature of these relationships. In Singer’s words “ordinary human beings... take an active part in... practices that require the sacrifice of the most important interests of members of other species in order to promote the most trivial interests of our own” (Singer 33). Sites of particular ethical grievance for Singer include the testing of oven cleaner on rabbits’ eyes (68) and of chemical warfare agents on monkeys (47), both of which have limited to non-existent practical uses. What is significant here is not the use of animals itself as unconscionable, but instead the extreme imbalance of interests for the parties involved. The important suggestion that exists within the monograph is the supposition that while the use of many animals for trivial reasons is unethical, arguably the use of some animals for reasons of necessity would be defensible. If the balance between the interests of the human and animal were more evenly distributed then use of the animal in this framework may be ethically allowable. Crucially then, utilitarian ideologies, whilst demonstrating a tendency to include animals in ethical consideration, are also apt to condone the use of animals if that act will benefit a great number of beings. This typifies the precarious position for animals in this ideology and similarly in Hardy’s novels where nonhuman welfare can become a negligible concern.

The ability of utilitarianism to condone certain amounts of suffering for some is one of the numerous reasons the ethical approach has attracted opposition from scholars (Frey 174). According to Frey, the central concerns with utilitarianism’s ability to function as a

moral code reside in the fact that “classical utilitarianism produces results strongly at odds with ordinary moral thinking” (174). A particular instance is its impersonality, asserting that we must consider all lives to hold the same value and thus treat all beings’ interests equally in any given situation, regardless of whether that being is one’s child or an utter stranger. In its calculated balancing of outcomes, utilitarianism’s ethics are prone to becoming robotic and inhumane. The moral code is driven by cool and fair pragmatics towards the lives of others, thinking in practical terms about what is realistically possible and how to achieve the most equal objectives. Though connected to the desires of humanitarianism, particularly in seeking to ease the plight of animals, utilitarian perspectives are distinct in their rejection of abstract ideals and future possibilities in preference of concrete realities. The humanitarian instincts explored in the previous chapter display an idealism which is rejected by utilitarian thinking. To summarise utilitarianism as it relates to animal issues, the term encapsulates acting out of pragmatism or purpose where animals are perceived through their utility, desiring the broadest easing of suffering enactable, and a reasonable balancing of interests which in some cases may justify casualties. Positioning Hardy as demonstrating such utilitarian beliefs, particularly its cool calculations, is strikingly at odds with what I have shown about the author’s emotive connection to animals. In order to give credibility to the claim, the following section explores relevant biographical material.

### Hardy’s Utilitarian Biography

A useful way into perceiving Hardy’s utilitarianism is to return once again to the author’s famous letter to the Humanitarian League. One pertinent line from that letter reads “And though we may not at present see how the principle of equal justice all round is to be carried out in its entirety, I recognise that the League is grappling with the question” (*Thomas Hardy’s Public Voice* 311). An element of this articulation worth noting is the concern with practicalities. Hardy expresses a clear desire to remedy the unfortunate position of those who do not receive equal justice, and yet the physical enactment of change leaves him perplexed. The difficulties Hardy sees in enacting equality, which the phrase above only references vaguely, can be deduced through looking further into biographical

material. The difficulties outlined there are underpinned by utilitarian thinking. The dual meanings of the word “utilitarianism” that I signal above become apparent in looking at Hardy’s life, as he demonstrates both a strong concern with utility or purpose and a desire to achieve the most good for the most beings. Though these meanings often intersect and impact one another, I will begin with the former.

Hardy’s association of animals with their utility was no doubt a legacy of his youth. In the rural world of his childhood Hardy was surrounded by agricultural goings-on and was at least partially desensitised to its necessities. In an anecdote featured in Florence Hardy’s biography of her husband she describes his memories of the Corn Law Agitation, and the game the young Thomas made of imitating protestors by brandishing a sword his father had made for him (*Early Life* 21). Florence notes that he took the sword and “this he dipped into the blood of a pig which had just been killed, and brandished it as he walked about the garden exclaiming ‘Free Trade or blood’” (*Early Life* 21). In this memory the blood of a pig, a liquid that so garishly marks the snow in *Jude*, is simply a useful prop for a childish game, the prosaic by-product of a household task. Moreover, in rural Dorset the line between survival and destitution was built upon this everyday use of animals. It did not condone outright cruelty, but certainly facilitated their death and consumption. Hardy himself knew many families even worse off than their firmly working-class home, such as a shepherd acquaintance who was so poor he died of starvation (Sherman, “Agricultural Laborer” 112). In a world where survival was in no way guaranteed and animal bodies were a valuable means of self-preservation, an animal’s utility to humans was an inescapable characteristic of animality itself, even to the most compassionate of children.

The impacts of such a childhood are exemplified in correspondence between Hardy and his first wife Emma. Since there was a tendency for Hardy to view animals from the perspective of their utility, particularly in instances where human life was at stake, it is reasonable to suggest that point of view led to accepting animal sacrifices for the sake of the greater human good. In some aforementioned correspondence with his wife, Hardy tells Emma about his plans to drown all but one of a litter of kittens because the household cannot, or does not desire to, care for them all (*Collected Letters* III 335, West 157). One

kitten they can find a use for, but the rest are a burden and therefore dispensed with. West uses this episode to argue that a component of Hardy's relationship to animals was economic (West 156), and his approach towards animal issues was at times decidedly measured (West 157). To further highlight her point West draws upon a particular poem of Hardy's and the publishing process of the piece. The poem "Horses Abroad" (1925) depicts the use of horses in conflict, emphasising their pitiful fate. While considered to be commentary upon the Boer War, which was being fought at the time of the poem's penning, it was not published until much later. Thus questions have been raised about why Hardy delayed releasing the poem and creating its desired impact on the public consciousness. In answer to that query, Richard Sylvia speculates that Hardy may well have postponed publishing the poem for the same reason he delayed publishing another poem of the same period titled "The Puzzled Game-Birds" (1899). That poem was held back from the public because, in Hardy's words "other [human] slaughter will fill people's minds for some time to come" (*Collected Letters* II 232). Sylvia deems this choice to display "a surprising degree of chauvinism on Hardy's part" (63), particularly because of his life-long associations with animal causes. Sylvia's assessment of the author's choice is reinforced by West's assertion that despite commiserating with acquaintances about the horses' plight, he engaged very little with actual humanitarian work for their benefit (170). Ultimately West characterises Hardy's choices around the poem as indicative of the author's careful cultivation of his public image (West 171). Hardy allowed himself to be associated with various humanitarian causes and societies only after his transition into poetry, leading to his recognition as "*the poet-humanitarian of his day*" (West 171). Before that shift from novel writing he sought an image less associated with activism and more traditionally respectable and gentlemanly. It is easy to connect the logical thinker presented above with an anecdote articulated in Hardy's diary entries, when he reminisces on the difficulty of a cart horse but that he would not dismount from the vehicle because of his need to arrive at his destination (*Life and Work* 225). A site of great difficulty for Hardy was the clear fact that animals were undeniably useful and that not using them greatly disadvantaged humans. The collection of choices Hardy made during his novel writing career, both minor and considerable, characterise the author as relating pragmatically to animal lives, and even at moments

disassociating from their welfare for the sake of other factors, such as his reputation, his earnings, and his own ease.

This theme within the biographical documents is further exemplified by the author's position on vivisection. Towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century there was a surge in vivisection in the scientific community, brought on by British attempts to advance alongside German and French physiologists. Consequently, a surge occurred in efforts to end vivisection on animals (Ritvo 158-9). However, amongst animal rights groups, such as the RSPCA, there was discussion about the importance of anti-vivisection work, particularly in relation to other issues seen as pressing, such as the treatment of livestock at markets by drovers (Ritvo 160). By the end of the century there was increasing distance between more mainstream efforts for animals and the anti-vivisectionists, who were perceived as somewhat "bitter" and "ill-tempered" (Ritvo 162). While most advocates of animals condemned the cruelty of vivisection, divisions formed between like-minded groups, and other issues such as confused rhetoric, accusatory polemics, and internal disputes created alienation. Hardy's position within the scene is telling. There is some evidence that Hardy opposed vivisection. In a statement written for the Vivisection Investigation League of New York, he expresses the sentiment that:

The discovery of the law of evolution, which revealed that all organic creatures are of one family, shifted the centre of altruism from humanity to the whole conscious world collectively. Therefore the practice of vivisection, which might have been defended while the belief ruled that men and animals are essentially different, has been left by that discovery without any logical argument in its favour. And if the practice, to the extent of merely inflicting slight discomfort now and then, be defended on grounds of good policy for animals as well as men it is nonetheless in strictness wrong, and stands precisely as would its practice on men themselves. (Hardy, *Life and Work* 373-4)

But though this excerpt suggests a strong opposition to the practice, that was not strictly the case. West investigates Hardy's relationship with anti-vivisection ideas and campaigners in her problematising of the writer's traditional humanitarian identity. West notes that when this statement above was later reprinted, Hardy inserted after the word

'defended' the bracketed clause "as I sometimes hold it may" (West 175). West astutely observes that the inclusion of this qualifier "draws attention to the ambiguity throughout the passage" (175). For instance, the reference to only "slight discomfort" potentially experienced by subjects which diminishes the perception of nonhuman suffering, and how the phrase "in strictness wrong" could be read as a blanket condemnation and yet also a suggestion that what is in strictness wrong might be in reality necessary. In a footnote West makes a brief connection to Singer's *Animal Liberation*. She highlights how Hardy's positioning of vivisection of animals as equal in wrongness to vivisections of humans is easily linked to Singer's position that experimentation on live subjects is only morally defensible when the speciesism of the practice is eliminated and both human and nonhuman subjects are utilised (175). Here is a clear and tangible example of the similarities I have drawn above between Singer's utilitarian philosophy and Hardy's perspective on animals. It seems reasonable to suggest that Hardy's hesitancy in giving his outright condemnation of vivisection could well have been related to the contemporaneous public frustrations with anti-vivisection rhetoric towards the end of the century and associations of the movement with bitter extremism. The author was certainly very careful about the causes he would put his name to and this example could easily be a manifestation of his authorial identity construction.

In characterising the utilitarian traits of Hardy's relation to animals surprising themes arise, such as the primacy of human needs within the greater group of living beings, and a logic-driven distancing from animal causes. A section of characterisation from *Tess* is particularly applicable here and suggests Hardy might have understood this part of his identity and explored it in his novels. While Tess and Angel traverse the tumultuous territory of revelations about their respective pasts, Angel finds he is able to disconnect from his new wife despite her tears of agony (202). The narrator explains that "Within the remote depths of [Angel's] constitution, so gentle and affectionate as he was in general, there lay hidden a hard logical deposit, like a vein of metal in a soft loam, which turned the edge of everything that attempted to traverse it" (*Tess* 202). The arable imagery of the metaphor is particularly relevant to the topic of this thesis, and expresses the harsh edge of Angel's plough like logic slicing through the softer substance of his compassion. It similarly

appears that Hardy's affectionate response to animals was often turned and sliced-through by the hard realities underpinning his utilitarian leanings.

### The Utility of Livestock and Agri-culture

Angel's characterisation in the above episode is but one example of the many utilitarian perceptions of animals that exist in the novels. I begin my close readings of the texts in the same vein as the analysis I have undertaken above, by starting with its more literal meaning, and show that the nonhumans that populate Hardy's Wessex farms are portrayed as undeniably useful creatures. I take the term 'useful creatures' from West, as she uses this during her exploration of Hardy's complicated humanitarianism, and while West uses it in a more general sense to explore all kinds of species, it is relevant here in understanding farm animals. A pertinent starting point in exploring the useful creatures of Wessex is a quote from a novel not under analysis in this thesis but another of Hardy's most famous works, *The Mayor of Casterbridge*. This novel does not contain much in the way of agricultural content, thus explaining its lack of inclusion in this study, but when the narrator begins the task of creating the setting of Casterbridge they note "Casterbridge lived by agriculture" (Hardy 49). By this the novel means that the crucial industry of the market town is the arable and livestock farming that surrounds it. Similarly, in the three novels that I explore, characters and their rural communities are sustained by agricultural pursuits.

This is especially visible in *Madding Crowd* because the bulk of the narrative is set around a singular farm and its workforce and thus the reader watches throughout how the industry provides security for the vulnerable working class. In her role as owner of the farm and as bailiff, Bathsheba offers employment to a group of rustic people. This fact is emphasised in a scene when Bathsheba first addresses her staff as their new employer (*Madding Crowd* 65). Here she is acquainted with each employee, advised of their role on the farm, and finally tells them of the bonus they shall receive. She explains for instance to Joseph Poorgrass "now here are ten shillings in addition as a small present, as I am a new comer" (65). The impact of this gift is accentuated when the narrator notes Bathsheba's embarrassment "at the sense of being generous in public" (65). The generosity of pay

characterises Weatherbury Farm as a place of great value in the rural community and this is particularly striking because Hardy was writing during a time of rural upheaval caused by a lack of job stability, decreases in pay, and the resulting mass migration to urban centres (Ward 9-10). In his essay “The Dorsetshire Labourer” Hardy muses upon the conditions of the rural worker noting with particular emphasis both the adverse conditions of modernity upon rustic workers and the importance of the stable patronage that characterised pre-modern farms. Because working class labourers were among the most disadvantaged of Victorian society, and therefore most susceptible to adversity, this group relied heavily upon the patronage of their employers for support through hardship (Hardy, “Dorsetshire” 255). As a result, when relationships between employer and employee were broken down by the factors described above, farm workers were “out of sight of patronage; and to be out of sight is to be out of mind when misfortune arises” (ibid). The dynamic depicted in *Madding Crowd* is particularly strong within this context and depicts the traditional farm not just as a productive entity but as an institution of social welfare. We see the community dynamic of Weatherbury farm appear in an even more forceful episode in the novel when farm employee Fanny Robin is found to be missing. Though Bathsheba is new to the farm and has never met Fanny, when she learns that Fanny’s whereabouts are unknown she orders a search for her and asks of her labourers “have you heard anything of Fanny?” (*Madding Crowd* 64). In this novel it appears that the pastoral role of the farmer is not just for the ovine flock but for their human one also. The economic and social benefits of communities built around farming are at the forefront of *Madding Crowd*, and thus the farming of animal bodies is framed as a crucial and charitable institution.

Furthermore, *Madding Crowd* speaks not just to the pecuniary and social importance of agriculture but also signals its affective benefits. Weatherbury Farm holds, beyond the potential for wealth, safety, and community, even more seductively the propensity to achieve harmony, purpose, and belonging. Agriculture is more than industry; it is culture, and that rustic culture is immensely valuable to Hardy’s imagining of country life. Perhaps the best example of Hardy’s perception of livestock farming in this way is the famous shearing scene in *Madding Crowd*. Towards the beginning of the novel, the labourers of Weatherbury Farm gather in the ancient shearing barn to shear Bathsheba Everdene’s

sheep. The whole episode in the barn works towards creating an atmosphere of timeless rustic harmony between people and nature. One of the most striking images in this scene which contributes to the tone is the description of the barn as a structure. The chapter begins with an architectural description of the building, which is compared to other ancient structures (113). In one descriptive section among a series, Hardy pictures the barn thus, “[t]he vast porches at the sides, lofty enough to admit a waggon laden to its highest with corn in the sheaf, were spanned with heavy-pointed arches of stone, broadly and boldly cut, whose very simplicity was the origin of grandeur not apparent in erections where more ornament had been attempted” (113). In typical Hardy fashion, the author’s early career in architecture is drawn upon to create setting, atmosphere, and theme. The passage goes on to emphasise that unlike the castle and the church, the shearing shed embodies continuity and repeated cycles (113). The human actions inside the castle and the church have been adapted and modified by changing times, while the shearing barn’s shearers carry on as they always have. The narrator conveys that time works differently in rural Wessex (114), as if the rapidity of change (or lack thereof) does not just demonstrate the comparative slowness of country life but is actually proof of time’s changed pace. The rural is made to be an alternative reality. While this slowness may strike city-dwellers as dull and backward, Hardy makes sure to frame it very carefully with his language. Instead, it is change that is figured as the negative. The narrator rejoices in the fact that the barn has “suffered not mutilation at the hands of time” (113). Time’s influence becomes disturbing, aggressive, and undesirable. In contrast, the barn possesses a “satisfied sense of functional continuity” (113), and the “feeling almost of gratitude, and quite of pride, at the permanence of the idea that had heaped it up” (113). This descriptive passage ends with the sentence: “So the barn was natural to the shearers, and the shearers were in harmony with the barn” (114). The building Hardy creates, which is defined by pure agricultural utility, is swathed in the language of mythology. The work of farming animals becomes not labour but a kind of sacred ritual.

The bucolic harmony of the shearing barn is a central tenet of the novel’s depiction of farming. For Michael Millgate the great barn demonstrates the importance of continuing the rustic way of life (“Hardy’s Achievement” 409). He posits that in the scene agriculture is

not just a human endeavour and manipulation of nature, but has a kind of permanence which relates to “the permanent features of the seasons and of the countryside” (“Hardy’s Achievement” 411). It is as if agriculture has no definitive beginning nor end, it always was and always will be, just like the cycle of the seasons. In fact the seasons are integral to the novel’s progress, the milestones of the farming year correlating with the human drama (Millgate, “Hardy’s Achievement” 411). This deliberate plotting helps create a sense of atmosphere, drives the narrative forward, and emphasises Weatherbury’s subservience to the season’s movements, but importantly it also suggests a harmony between humans, nature, and agricultural endeavours; it naturalises the seasonal activities of arable and livestock farming. The naturalising quality is remarked upon by Eithne Henson in *Landscape and Gender in the Novels of Charlotte Bronte, George Eliot, and Thomas Hardy: The Body of Nature* (2011). She notes that the barn scene, in its comparison of the continuity of the barn with the changeability of the church and castle, subverts the authority of patriarchy, but reinforces the power dynamics of livestock farming (137). The harmonious labour of the scene plays into the novel’s reading as pastoral in genre. Jakob Lothe notes the ways Hardy demonstrates and plays with traditional pastoral conventions, such as referencing “an imaginary Golden Age” (125), such conventions fundamental to the Wessex setting (125). Allusions to this age can be seen at other points during the passage. An example is when Gabriel shears a sheep and the shorn animal stands up like “Aphrodite rising from the foam” (116) and appears as a “clean and sleek creature” (115). The classical allusion speaks to the perception of a continuing bucolic era of which the sheep is a part. Though shearing under rough hands may be distressing for some sheep, comparatively this one is only “startled and shy at the loss of its garment” (116), anthropomorphic language colouring the episode in etiquette and femininity. The classical allusions and anthropomorphism suggest collaboration and exchange between shearer and sheep, undercutting any sense of exploitation the novel suggests elsewhere. The graceful sheep, the majestic building, and the timeless action of shearing together build a moving illustration of a farming lifestyle which nourishes not just human bodies but souls. Here the utility of animal bodies stretches beyond its basic purpose and into the affective realms of culture, history, and identity.

Further contributing to agriculture's utilitarian characterisation, the shearing shed scene also articulates the direct and tangible uses of livestock to the human population. In this famous scene the Weatherbury workers shear Bathsheba's sheep in order to sell the wool at market. Here the narrator describes a bundle of wool carried by one of the farmhands as "Three-and-a-half-pounds of unadulterated warmth for the winter enjoyment of persons unknown and far away" (116). In this image the products of the sheep's bodies are pictured in far flung places and worn by mysterious figures, an almost mythical kind of pastoralism coming to life on a grand scale. The bucolic tone of the phrase is emphasised by the wool's condition as "unadulterated", as if in its purity and perfection it represents the pinnacle of the farmer's purpose. The image invites the reader to luxuriate in the sheep's product. A soft white ewe provides a warm wool jumper and in this sensory depiction *Madding Crowd* revels in the beneficial uses of animal bodies for the people that consume and enjoy them.

#### Utilitarian Farmers are Pragmatic not Altruistic

The evocation of the significant utilities of animals that plays out in *Madding Crowds* leads into a more sophisticated balancing of interests, which are at the core of utilitarian ethics. Because animals are so useful, characters take that use into account when making ethical decisions and consider how the most good can realistically be achieved. From this perspective humanitarian feelings are not always enough to justify compassionate actions; there must be a useful and generally beneficial outcome which is precipitated by those actions. Because animals are so fundamental to the successful functioning of rural society, not using them—not breeding, killing, or eating them—becomes not simply an ethically minded choice but often an impossible one. We see this play out in Hardy's novels in the way characters are moved by empathetic feelings towards nonhumans but cannot or will not act upon them. In this crucial sense, practicality and utility dominate decision making in which the interests of humans and animals are weighed against one another. The fact that in Hardy compassionate feeling does not always inspire altruism is illuminated by Keen. In her analysis of how Hardy expresses and encourages empathy through his fiction, Keen makes arguments about the author's conception of the term 'altruism.' Keen posits that

Hardy's work understands altruism as, at times, a feeling rather than an action, citing the novel *Two on a Tower* (1882) as an example. In this novel the fragility of altruism is exposed when it is crippled under the stronger grip of other desires (Keen 361). Building upon this premise, Keen goes on to show that "we find clear delineations of the obstacles that baulk even the most feeling of beings" such as Tess Durbeyfield and Jude Fawley (384). On the farm these obstacles to altruism are vast and seemingly insurmountable.

Consequently, while Jude might experience altruistic impulses towards livestock he finds he cannot act upon them. As Arabella famously says, "poor folks must live" (56) and Jude acknowledges the truth of that statement. Sumpter signals that while *Jude* does not necessarily endorse using animals it also refrains from "dismissing the pragmatism" of the practice (670). Agriculture's characterisation as a necessary practical endeavour is accentuated by a description early on in *Jude*. As the protagonist walks out onto a field in which he is to act as scarecrow, he notes the look of the landscape around him. The "brown surface of the field [goes] right up towards the sky all round, where it [is] lost by degrees in the mist that shut out the actual verge, and accentuate[s] the solitude" (13), leading Jude to state "How ugly it is here!" (14). In adding metaphorical significance to the image, Hardy writes "fresh harrow-lines seemed to stretch like the channellings in a piece of new corduroy, lending a meanly utilitarian air to the expanse" (14). The agricultural space Jude enters into is figured as a piece of clothing, one that is unpleasant to experience and ill-suited to his sentimental nature but will keep Jude warm nonetheless. The distance the novels depict here between sentiments like compassion and the reality of peasantry is further accentuated by an even more forceful motif which runs throughout the texts. In the motif these options become dichotomous and mutually exclusive. Moreover, in the dichotomy, polarity is created not just between kindness and calculation but between compassion and survival. These novels dictomise altruism and self-preservation, and make extreme the balancing action at the heart of utilitarian thinking. When characters act out of compassion and humanitarian instincts they risk themselves, and making practical choices—both in the farmyard and in a more general sense—is the only way to secure one's own welfare. Ultimately, in creating this dichotomous motif, the novels often condone

calculated acts of self-interest such as exploitation of the nonhuman other. The greater good that utilitarianism seeks allows harm to be enacted for the sake of human survival.

The motif is most striking in *Tess* and *Jude*. In the former, the altruism versus self-preservation dichotomy is explored primarily within a human realm, namely in the relations between Tess and her husband Angel. Crucially though, because Tess is so affiliated with animals throughout the narrative (as I explored in the previous chapter), her experiences often speak to those of nonhumans. In this way, depictions of Tess's relations with others take on layers of meaning. In fact, Tess and nonhuman animals are allied in such subtle and important ways that I argue Tess's character works as a metonym for wider, nonhuman life. As a result, the didactic meanings of her narrative can be extended outwards into the world of livestock in useful ways. The primary way in which *Tess* explores the altruism versus self-preservation dichotomy is through the marriage plot between Tess and Angel. The choice between selfish survival and compassionate destruction forms the very basis of two key moments in the narrative, firstly, how Tess determines to respond to Angel's proposal, and secondly, how Angel determines to react to Tess' revelation of her rape and child. Tess chooses the altruistic option and is honest with Angel (though only after they are married), whilst Angel decides to do what he believes will preserve his hopes for the future and leaves his new bride. What is particularly noteworthy about Tess and Angel's experience of the dichotomy is Hardy's deliberate signalling of it via the language of both the narrator and the characters. Throughout Tess's experience of the choice the word 'self-preservation' is repeated. First, when Tess attempts to expose her past to Angel but finds she cannot, Hardy writes that "her instinct of self-preservation [is] stronger than her candour" (142). Later, Angel and Tess discuss how to proceed with their separation and she tells him she will "obey" no matter the request (193). This prompts Angel to reply, rather brutally, "[y]ou are good. But it strikes me that there is a want of harmony between your present mood of self-sacrifice and your past mood of self-preservation" (ibid). Though Angel's words distil Tess' challenging position into over-simplified accusations, his juxtaposition captures the essence of the ethical question she is faced with; the same one with which agriculturalists are faced when they empathise with their animals. The ethics of situations which stimulate compassion and yet where that compassion would be

disadvantageous is a question *Tess* grapples with as part of the author's broader philosophical exploration, a question that bled into many facts of his life and work. Here, in the heroine's experience of the ethical conundrum, altruism is likely ruinous.

In terms of thinking specifically about how the dichotomy relates to animals, Angel's treatment of Tess is perhaps more relevant as it can be more easily transferred onto human-nonhuman relations. The potential for ruin is utmost in Angel's mind as he deliberates. Angel's experience of the dichotomy is largely articulated during their sojourn as newlyweds, when Angel attempts to determine how to behave in light of the new information about Tess's past. It becomes clear through Hardy's language that Angel's difficulty in moving forwards results from conflicting feelings of sympathy and practicality. The narrator conveys that he tries "desperately to advance among the new conditions in which he stood. Some consequent action was necessary; yet what?" (168). His response is one of action; it is proactive, analytical, focused. Angel becomes "ill with thinking" (177). When conversing with Tess about the steps they are to take, he explains his misgivings about the potential for, years from their current point, some rumour of her past reaching them and their family. Angel imagines the pain, regret, and ostracization that might cause (178). Angel's cold reaction is jarring when compared to his previously tender characterisation. Hardy addresses the change. The narrator explains that, as aforementioned, "within the remote depths of his constitution, so gentle and affectionate as [Angel] was in general, there lay hidden a hard logical deposit, like a vein of metal in a soft loam, which turned the edge of everything that attempted to traverse it" (176). The logical side of Angel's temperament is figured like plough; a harsh metallic instrument bending and manipulating its environment, and specifically the organic world. Angel certainly experiences compassion towards Tess but is swayed by self-serving considerations. This courtship, marriage, and separation narrative is a place where the novel explores the incompatibility of self-centred desires and compassion for the other. In *Tess* Hardy begins to establish this important division, and in doing so positions altruism as valiant but certainly ludicrous. The echoes of this idea continue into the author's last novel. What the dichotomy means in terms of not just human characters but even more profoundly nonhuman livestock is explored more thoroughly in *Jude*.

One could argue that the entirety of *Jude* is an exploration of this premise, and furthermore, the dichotomy is very often framed in relation to nonhumans. The idea is epitomised in the character of Jude who experiences very distinctively and repeatedly the personal disadvantages of altruistic impulses and therefore demonstrates the triumph of pragmatics in his universe. From early in the novel Jude is characterised by his altruism towards nonhumans. The narrator states that “he was a boy who could not himself bear to hurt anything” (16). The novel goes on to explore this side of Jude in the episode in which Jude has been hired as a scarecrow but finds that he does not have the propensity to actively scare the birds away and deprive them of a meal (15-17). While allowing the birds to eat from the farmer’s field Jude is apprehended by the farmer himself, who immediately beats and fires the young boy (17). This leads the narrator to contemplate that “This weakness of character, as it may be called, suggested that he was the sort of man who was born to ache a good deal before the fall of the curtain upon his unnecessary life” (16). The sentiment established in these scenes echoes throughout *Jude*, from the pig-killing scene where he secures himself a more meagre profit from the meat by killing the animal in an unworkmanlike way (56), to the relationships he builds with Arabella and then Sue in which he often neglects his own desires, beliefs, and even health, leading to his death at the end of the novel (329). In this manner Jude’s life serves to enact the self-destruction humanitarian ethics are likely to cause in Hardy’s universe.

While seeking to ease suffering, altruists in fact only create more. Both *Jude’s* characters and the narrator alike articulate this state of existence in *Jude’s* Wessex. For instance, Sue laments in a moment of hardship that “Nature’s law [is] mutual butchery” (251) and Philliston (Sue’s husband) notes to Arabella that “[c]ruelty is the law pervading all nature and society” (259). In fact, Philliston’s narrative furthers the altruism versus self-preservation dichotomy in that his selfless release of Sue from their difficult marriage leads to his ostracisation by this community and discharge from his role as school master, positioning the narrator to suggest that “no man had ever suffered more inconvenience from his own charity... than Philliston had done in letting Sue go” (290). Finally, this same sentiment is expressed by Jude in an impassioned speech to a gathered crowd in

Christminster, in which he tells of his futile dreams of academia and subsequent revelations about the state of his society. The protagonist posits that one must be “cold-blooded as a fish and as selfish as a pig to have a really good chance of being one of this country’s worthies” (264). In Wessex, if notability and success, or even survival, are prioritised by an individual then altruism is certainly absurd. It is important to note that the novel never advocates for this reality nor revels in it, but displays the egregiousness of its truth. The approach the novel takes to rendering Hardy’s perception of reality, which is decidedly bitter, reflects the subject matter he sought to explore in the novel, namely the inequalities and oppressions sanctioned by the structures of Victorian society. In the landscape of *Jude*, altruism is not a reasonable way to engage with the world, let alone animal species such as livestock.

The novel explores this supposition further through the experiences of another character who has a stunning propensity not for altruism but instead for self-preservation. Jude’s wife Arabella is characterised as the inverse of the protagonist from the outset of their relationship. In Caroline Sumpter’s articulation of this difference she astutely notes that “[u]nlike Arabella, Jude is prey to sympathetic instinct” (667). The use of the ‘prey’ is apt here with its associations of powerlessness. If Jude is prey, Arabella is certainly his predator. Throughout the narrative Arabella makes active and discerning choices regarding her position and her future, particularly in relation to romantic partners. Her conscious seduction of Jude is emphasised in scenes such as their initial meeting—where she throws a pig’s phallus at him (34) establishing a mood of recklessness and sexuality between them—and even more vividly when she is seen to make alterations to her appearance for the sake of enticing him (35, 51). Her impact on men seeks the ultimate goal of marriage and her goal is cemented through yet another calculating manoeuvre: a fabricated pregnancy. When, after they have married, Arabella reveals to Jude that she is in fact not with child, she claims to have been merely mistaken (53), but this assertion is undermined by previous interactions with her confidants (44). Her instincts for self-preservation see her reject altruistic choices—and even the wellbeing of others—thus allowing her to secure three different romantic partners during the novel and renewed security with each one. As Sumpter observes, thinking of both *Jude* and *The Woodlanders* (1887) “The least

sympathetic characters—Arabella and Fitzpiers [of *The Woodlanders*—are also the most socially adapted, best placed to secure their own happiness and survival” (677). In *Jude* selfish choices produce more favourable outcomes.

Further revelations about the utilitarian discourse of *Jude* appear through deeper consideration of Arabella’s character, namely her relationship to animals. Norman Holland usefully expands on Arabella’s character in his article exploring the significance of Christian symbolism in the novel. Holland demonstrates the plethora of ideas that are connected to Arabella’s identity including alcoholism, marriage, sexuality, and the female body (50). Interestingly, and perhaps rather surprisingly, Holland connects Arabella with the porcine imagery of the novel (51). This association ranges from her pre-marital occupation on her family’s pig farm (34), to chasing some escaped pigs with Jude while the couple are courting (45), to the pig the couple keep as newlyweds (53). It is relevant here to expand from Holland’s assertion into recognising that Arabella’s porcine characteristics are meaningfully drawn out in the pig-killing scene where she so violently injures the animal. In this scene of brutal opposition between beings, Arabella and her pig are in fact allied in a crucial way. What creates the tangible tension of the episode is not just that the pig is killed, but that the pig does not want to die. Its desire to survive is expressed through its screeches, which begin as a “squeak of surprise” rising to “repeated cries of rage” and eventually a single “cry of despair; long-drawn, slow and hopeless” (55). On hearing the increasing agitation of the pig Arabella takes a knife to its windpipe and silences it (56). While Arabella voices her embarrassment at their botched butchery as the cause for her silencing of the animal, her building frustration during the scene, accentuated by her speech in which she cries at Jude and speaks “scornfully” (56), also displays deeper levels of emotion. Arguably the bellows of the pig are so disturbing to the seasoned pig farmer because they vividly betray the self-preservation and survival instincts that Arabella herself feels. Neither the pig nor the woman are self-sacrificial beings. As Arabella poignantly remarks at the close of the episode, in the much-cited phrase, “Poor folks must live” (56). Though there are clear affiliations between the pig and Jude due to the man’s deep empathy for the animal and more general allegiance with the natural world, I posit here that it is equally remarkable to note how Arabella and the pig mirror one another in their adamant

desire for survival. Therein the novel dramatises the essence of the clash between human and nonhuman on the farm: the agriculturalist seeks to survive through exploiting the animal, but the animal seeks survival also, and in this way despite the great disparities, human and nonhuman are united in their basic biological longing to live. *Jude* therefore performs a simultaneous legitimisation of both the pig's actions and Arabella's violence, each a foil of the other. The novel builds through these interactions, and particularly Arabella's character, an ontology in which the only way to survive is to prioritise the self. Holland's work on Christian symbolism reinforces this point. He argues that since self-sacrifice is pictured as futile by the text—because the compassionate Jude dies and kind Sue descends into depression while Arabella thrives—and thus “the martyrdom of Christ becomes a mockery” (Holland 56). Similarly the humanitarian ethics so associated with Christian doctrine disintegrate under the pragmatic fist of utilitarianism.

The altruism versus self-preservation motif that pervades *Jude* speaks to a broader textual concern with regards to the reasonable and effective limits of altruism. Hardy's exploration of altruism's potential and limitations exists within a contemporaneous exploration of the same theme within scientific literature. Understanding the claims and connotations of this literature opens up Hardy's work and his representations of altruistic behaviours. Caroline Sumpter illuminates this trend in an article which considers the science of sympathy in relation to *Jude*. Sumpter notes that while the author's interest in Darwinian science has received ongoing scholarly attention, “few critics have considered that interest in relation to his understanding of sympathy” (665). She argues that the novel is a manifestation of the author's fascination with the phenomenon of sympathy, its development in humans and nonhumans alike, and its impacts on behavioural choices (ibid). *Jude* thus explores sympathy and compassion's ‘natural history’ (ibid). Sumpter notes the importance of the work of a collection of key Victorian thinkers in understanding altruistic feelings and actions, and for the sake of outlining their work here I am going to focus on three significant voices highlighted by Sumpter—Charles Darwin, T. H. Huxley, and Herbert Spencer—as they are critical to thinking about the efficacy of altruism while Hardy was writing. Each of these men made claims about why humans (and other animals) experienced altruistic desires and what impact these had on communities and individuals.

Darwin is associated most strongly with the evolutionary theories set out in *On the Origin of Species* (1859), however there are other important texts which develop Darwin's work further. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals* (1872) is primarily concerned with, as the title suggests, the way species demonstrate feeling, and rather controversially for the period Darwin emphatically stated that animals do express emotions that we are able to register. For instance, "the deep grunt of satisfaction offered by a pig, when pleased with its food, is widely different from its harsh scream of pain or terror" (96). That scream will of course be familiar to any reader of *Jude*. In another of Darwin's works, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (1871), emotional states are similarly a site of analysis with the author positing that sympathy is a state experienced by the human and nonhuman alike (121, 126). In terms of evolutionary theory and how it relates to sympathy, Darwin suggests that there is a reasonable basis for the development of sympathetic social instincts because of the protective efforts this would inspire. He writes, "Those communities, which included the greatest number of the most sympathetic members would flourish best, and raise the greatest number of offspring" (*Descent* 130). While Darwin articulates altruism's crucial biological uses, other prominent thinkers explored more deeply the less useful trends relating to its practice.

The work of T. H. Huxley builds upon the formative assertions of Darwin to advance further into the territory of evolution. In the address "Evolution and Ethics", which was published in 1894, Huxley begins with a temporal exploration of the Sussex Downs around his home, noting the gradual changes of the environment through millennia despite its seeming transcendence of time (59-63). He uses this setting to muse upon natural selection, evolution and more general universal processes of nature, which leads into his consideration of the role of sympathy. Within the broader setting of the South Downs Huxley figures a metaphorical garden which symbolises the separation of the wild landscape which is governed by "general cosmic process" (68), from the space cultivated by humans (67). The ability of human animals to cultivate spaces which attempt to defy natural processes applies also to altruism which attempts to defy the biological reality of competition, suffering, and pain. For Huxley while some humans may strive to cultivate a garden of compassion, those altruistic beings are unlikely to succeed or thrive. He posits

“The followers of ‘the golden rule’ may indulge in high hopes of heaven, but they must reckon with the certainty that other people will be masters of the earth. What would become of the garden if the gardener treated all the weeds and slugs and birds and trespassers as he would like to be treated, if he were in their place?” (90-91). Huxley highlights the impossibility of cultivating anything of value when the goal is to appease all living things.

The characterisation of sympathetic feeling and altruistic action as flawed was then epitomised in the work of Herbert Spencer. Spencer is most recognised for his theory of Social Darwinism, in which the author perceived that the processes which Darwin ascribed to the natural world were similarly present in social environments. In his reckoning, those who were most successful in society were those most suited to its conditions (Lewis 155). Because, according to Spencer, society functioned in this way alongside the natural world, human tendencies and practices—just like biological attributes—could similarly be amplified or eradicated by natural selection. Spencer understood sympathy as one such tendency. In fact, for Spencer those who were “unduly altruistic” were likely to be phased out because of their inability to survive long enough to procreate (204). Sumpter describes this idea as the “Spencerian concern that excess sympathy is an evolutionary liability” (677). Hence while Darwin recognised the benefits of sympathy and altruism to the broader social group, both Huxley and Spencer argue for their disadvantages to the actor themselves. The dichotomous relationship between altruism and self-preservation I have drawn out above in Hardy’s novels correlates to contemporary scientific rhetoric on the subject. The knowledge of Hardy’s engagement with and positioning within this debate around sympathy enhances even further the literary significance of the dichotomous trope I highlight and its fundamental thematic importance.

If, as Hardy’s novels so often suggest, altruism and self-preservation are mutually exclusive and thus compassionate acts are deeply flawed, then there is no more apt passage underpinning this than one which occurs at the outset of *Jude*. I use the short excerpt to conclude the close reading section of this chapter because it so well encapsulates the utilitarianism within Hardy’s ideology, captures Hardy’s conscious involvement in

contemporary dialogues, and most significantly for the chapter, suggests what utilitarianism means for livestock. At the opening of the novel, Jude is overcome with pity for some hungry birds and neglects his scarecrow duties to let them feed. When he is beaten and dismissed by his employer, this leads to the following passage:

Jude leaped out of arm's reach, and walked along the trackway weeping; not from the pain, though that was keen enough; not from the perception of the flaw in the terrestrial scheme, by which what was good for God's birds was bad for God's gardener; but with the awful sense that he had wholly disgraced himself before he had been a year in the parish, and hence might be a burden to his great-aunt for life. (16)

Though not Jude's focus, the "flaw in the terrestrial scene" as Hardy calls it is significant here. The phrase considering God's birds and gardeners contains echoes of Huxley's extended garden metaphor, his lecture delivered and published while Hardy was writing *Jude* and presumably influencing his phrasing (Sumpter 685). Highlighted within this language of grand scale and divinity is the ruthless rivalry of living beings for finite resources. The pastoral setting of the metaphor suggests life or death, survival or destruction, in the understated adjectives "good" and "bad". Within the context of the garden, a natural space cultivated by human hands, it is impossible to extend active sympathy out to the other without undermining one's own chance of survival. It is a position articulated even more blatantly by Hardy in his nonfiction writing, where he notes "the emotions have no place in a world of defect" (*Life* 153). Two key points about this telling garden metaphor are firstly the way the phrase frames certain areas of the natural world as in the domain of human utility—perceived in a general sense as 'the garden'—and secondly how the juxtaposition of the images enacts a balancing of interests, those of the bird and of the gardener. The emphasis on human utilisation of nature and the cold reckoning of needs imagined here articulates the two central tenets of utilitarianism itself.

Since the passage underpins utilitarianism as it is expressed by Hardy, considering what this can be taken to infer for animals and specifically livestock is important for getting a clearer picture of Hardy's animal ethics. The domestic livestock animal is a species

captured in the realm of the aphorism, because it is akin to the nonhuman bird and yet also held within the realm of that which is cultivated by the gardener. Livestock are the living products of the gardener's hands. The relationship of the aphorism to ideas about animal rights is signalled by Sumpter in her exploration of sympathy's natural history. She writes, "In a nineteenth century evolutionary context... these discussions also had new implications for the treatment and classification of animals" (669). Sumpter sets out the implications of varying understandings of sympathy for nonhumans, for instance reading the pig-scene as exemplifying Jude's altruistic tendencies, but does not take the step this thesis does in considering what the broader ramifications of the ideology are for livestock such as the pig. In thinking about the implications for farm animals that are suggested by the quote, one pivotal point is the way the construction favours the human. The phrase emphasises the negative ramifications for the human gardener should the bird succeed in taking what is needed to secure its wellbeing. If the clause is inverted to "what was good for God's gardeners was bad for God's bird" immediately the impact is reduced, arguably because a human life instinctively holds more value to the reader. There is an understanding that the gardener's survival is the fate we favour despite the disadvantage to the bird. Additionally the construction of the sentence also figures the supremacy of the human through the use of alliteration, "God's gardeners" creating a subtle, even subconscious, affinity between the human and the divine. Functioning within Hardy's expression here is speciesism which favours anthropocentric logic. It demonstrates a hierarchy of lives which is expressed elsewhere in his writing, such as his famous quote from an interview with William Archer in which he asks: "what are by books but one plea against 'man's inhumanity to man,' women, and the *lower* animals?" (Hardy quoted in Millgate, *Thomas Hardy* 379) (emphasis mine). The prioritising logic displayed is particularly dangerous for the livestock animal as opposed to the wild because of the farm animal's utility. During the novel Jude allows the rooks to eat (14), agonises over the pain of a trapped rabbit (175), and yet butchers his pig (56). Even if animals were extended the compassion that consanguinity seemed to demand for Hardy, surely the garden metaphor suggests that livestock, the objects of human labour and expense, would be the last bastion in that progression. If the rook cannot feed on worms from the garden, what hope does the gardener's quadrupedal livelihood have of benevolence?

## Conclusion

In this rather pessimistic sense, humanitarian ethics are undermined by the utilitarian thinking that similarly structures farming in Hardy. In the novels explored above it is often the case that the only reasonable way to treat livestock is as objects of utility which ensure a series of beneficial outcomes for the human population. When choices arise between treating animals humanely and disadvantaging the human actor or exploiting them and advantaging the human, the texts frequently demonstrate the nonsensical impracticality of the former and the rewards of the latter. Hardy's penchant for practicality and his considered balancing of interests leads his novels to critique the actual propensity for universal altruism and the potential outcomes of its enactment. His work suggests—particularly forcefully by *Jude*—that the physical execution of universal compassion is not only impossible on any grand scale but in fact akin to self-destruction. Hence, if acting compassionately on behalf of the other leads to more suffering rather than less, it is reasonable to then accept this is simply the condition of existence and resist any urge to control it. Under the pragmatic eye of utilitarianism, the utility of farm animals is forefront and the futility of sparing them is unquestionable. The texts manifest and explore these ideas through various literary techniques including depictions of agricultural communities, revelling in the tangible enjoyment of animal products and the employment of pastoral conventions to display the idyll of rustic culture that is founded upon farming. Also evident are characterisations which dramatise utilitarian thinking, the dichotomisation of altruism and self-preservation, and finally the engagement with contemporary debate through the extended garden metaphor. Through this lens, animal farms are the necessary and unavoidable centre of a thriving rural community, one which thinks realistically about achieving the most good for the most crucial members: its people.

The limitations and weaknesses of humanitarian desires pictured in the above ways creates a bleak fate for the livestock animals of Wessex and real Victorian animals. However, while as I have demonstrated the utilitarian thinking is particularly strong by *Jude*, equally Hardy's humanitarian desire for easing the suffering of all beings is similarly robust in the

novel, the titular character a stunning embodiment of the ideology. While the brutal outlook of this chapter's assessment of the novels may suggest that Hardy's pragmatism leads to a strong sense of pessimism in his novels, it is not quite that straightforward. In fact the next and final analytical chapter of the thesis takes on the battle that is enacted between the humanitarian and utilitarian in the three novels I have focused on, and attempts to understand what that clash might achieve. By understanding not just the two prevalent discourses that determine how farming is presented, but what their coexistence and collisions say, a more complete image of Hardy's animal farms can be discovered, along with what they say it means to use animals.

## Chapter Four: Hardy the Wordsmith

While Hardy identified as a humanitarian and sought to treat animals compassionately, he equally perceived the need to balance human interests against animal ones and the necessity of pragmatism for the rural population. Consequently his fictional farming industry exemplifies empathy for the lives of nonhumans and depictions of their essential utility, as well as advocacy for animal protection and the impossibility of true altruism. To come to a more complete understanding of Hardy's animal agriculture, it is therefore crucial to consider the coexistence of these polarised ideologies and their impacts within the texts. This chapter seeks to understand what textual outcome the contradictory representations of farming produce. In the following I set out the literary ramifications and impacts of Hardy's disparate depictions of the farm. The results of the two discourses are powerful. I argue that the humanitarian and utilitarian discourses which structure farming in Hardy clash against one another so utterly that they create an unsettling and affective reading experience. A useful way of understanding this affective impact is through cognitive dissonance theory. The texts' ideological inconsistency can be seen to mimic a state of cognitive dissonance. Crucial to this state is the production of an irreconcilable tension. I further demonstrate that this state is motivational; it encourages the reader to consider human-animal relationships further and ponder possible means to relieve the paradoxes involved in animal utilisation - a challenge which Hardy pursued but could not overcome himself. The chapter illustrates how Hardy's novels engage in a unique way with pressing animal issues. To this end, I begin the chapter setting out the established scholarly understandings of Hardy's fictional ambiguities, to then put forward cognitive dissonance as a valuable new approach in unpacking the cryptic nature of his novels. I next explain current psychological understandings of the cognitive dissonance phenomenon, how the concept relates to animal issues, and the benefits of its use in literary studies. Then, the chapter turns to Hardy, beginning with the biographical evidence which suggests the author's experience of the state, to then explore its dramatisations in the novels. The final sections of the chapter look at what this technique means for the reading experience and for the impact of the novel.

## A Series of Seemings

It is a common practice within Hardy scholarship to highlight conflicting qualities of both the author and the author's work. The conflicted images of livestock farming are best understood as knitted into this complex fabric of warps and wefts, made of ideas pulling in different directions. Biographer Claire Tomalin summarises Hardy's personal polarity in the blurb to her book when she describes him as a "believer and an unbeliever, a socialist and a snob, an unhappy husband and a desolate widower". Unsurprisingly these antithetical beliefs bleed into his fiction, a fact the author himself was conscious of. In the preface to *Jude*, Hardy characterises his writing as "a series of seemings, or personal impressions" and he notes that as a result "the question of their consistency or their discordance, of their permanence or their transitoriness, [is] regarded as not of the first moment" (5). However, just because the novels are not saying something with perfect clarity or consistency does not mean they do not say anything. Rather, the ambiguity and elusiveness of the texts adds to their literary accomplishments and enhances the interest of its scholars.

Different scholars have different ways of understanding the lack of ideological consistency and its textual implications. West understands Hardy's fiction as approximations of life which belie strict systems of philosophy (49). Similarly, Virginia Woolf, in her assessment of Hardy's skill as an author, argues that it is the avoidance of didacticism which makes Hardy's great novels great, and conversely that it is in his attempts to push straight forward messaging that his works fail (324). Shires perceives Hardy's work as presenting "questionings and not answers" and in doing so he writes "subtly, against the grain" ("And I Was Unaware" 35-6). For these scholars, there is a subversive and probing quality to Hardy's ideological instability, and his ambiguity is left unconquered. Penny Boumelha sees the lack of stability as foundational to Hardy's characterisations of women. Female characters are shaped in ways which echo back to the reader numerous contemporary ideas about femininity, and this presents to the reader a "hierarchy of discourses" which compete and are unfulfilled (*Thomas Hardy and Women* 6).

Kristin Brady takes Boumelha's understanding one step further when she suggests that Hardy's work is not only presenting discourses consciously to the reader, but that the writer himself is an "unstable conduit for the proliferation of various and conflicting discourses about power and gender" (101). In this sense, Hardy's work is a map of his cultural landscape, one which he consciously and unconsciously reproduces the landmarks of. While Hardy's status as both a conduit of discourses and a writer of ambiguity are helpful when attempting to understand the clashing representations of animal farming, I want to contribute a new way of perceiving the author's disparate style which has not yet been put forward. While scholars at times have drawn on the psychological phenomenon of cognitive dissonance in their analysis of Hardy (West 42, Lyons 347), there is yet to be a significant link made between the concept and his unique style nor has there been a sustained analysis of the concept's illuminating potential for Hardy. In the following I illustrate the benefits of such an approach.

### Cognitive Dissonance and Animal Ethics

In the landscape of the farm these "seemings", as Hardy calls them, are so disparate, so characterised by incongruity, that they produce a lingering tension. The existence of incongruous beliefs within individuals and cultures has been clarified and understood through cognitive dissonance theory. Moreover, the theory is not only useful here due to the ideological conflict of the texts but also due to the theory's respected and prominent role in animal-centred scholarship. Firstly, it is useful to set out the origins of the term. Cognitive dissonance (henceforth CD) is an idea founded in social psychology. It was coined and elucidated in 1975 by Leon Festinger in *A Theory of Cognitive*. Festinger begins by establishing the inconsistencies that typically exist in human cognitions, giving the example of individuals who know of smoking's negative health implications yet continue to smoke (2). He intends to examine the existence of dissonant ideas and how individuals sustain them. Festinger defines that state of cognitive dissonance as "an antecedent condition which leads to activity orientated towards dissonance reduction just as hunger leads to activity orientated towards hunger reduction" (3). Essentially CD sustains itself through

avoidance of recognising one's own dissonance. When an individual's attention is drawn to their dissonance, it produces a deep feeling of discomfort which the individual typically desires to ease (Tavris and Aronson 13). CD has occupied a respected position within the canon of major psychological theories (Vaidis and Bran 1). Though there have been recent calls for revisions and methodological improvements to the theoretical framework, CD, as the authors of such revisions stress, is still a worthwhile tool with the power to illuminate much about cognition (ibid). The term encapsulates both the theory itself and the state "of tension that occurs whenever a person holds two cognitions... that are psychologically inconsistent" (Tavris and Aronson 13). The need for explicit terminology in discussing CD is part of calls for new developments to the theory, and a pursuit which is equally necessary for this thesis. In the view of social psychologists D. C. Vaidis and A. Bran, it is clearest to refer to the theory broadly as "cognitive dissonance theory," the trigger of the arousal "inconsistency," and the experience of uncomfortable arousal itself as a "cognitive dissonance state" (CDS) (Vaidis and Bran 2). This chapter uses Vaidis and Bran's terminology in applying the concepts to Hardy's novels.

Cognitive dissonance theory is relevant to human-animal relations because it is a convincing answer to the inconsistencies inherent in how we treat animals. The theory is particularly illuminating in thinking about carnism, a practice in which these inconsistencies are most evident and violent. Various scholars have recently begun applying CD theory as part of investigating modern meat-eating practices. In contributing to the endeavour Brock Bastian and Steve Loughnan use cognitive dissonance to unpack what they have termed the "meat paradox". In defining the paradox they state "[m]any people enjoy eating meat but few enjoy harming or killing other sentient creatures. These inconsistent beliefs create a "meat paradox"; people simultaneously dislike hurting animals and like eating meat" (Loughnan et al. 156). While a large proportion of Western populations consume animal products, "a vast majority of meat-eaters find [animal suffering] offensive, emotionally disturbing, and potentially disruptive to their dietary habits" (Bastian and Loughnan 279). Those involved in carnism are attached to the practice for various reasons, from customary behaviour, to sensory pleasure, to economic benefit. Bastian and Loughnan identify two key types of stakeholders in carnism, the consumers

and the producers, both of which contribute to the fact that in 2010 in the US alone the meat industry slaughtered 9 billion land animals and contributed 6% to the country's GDP (Batian and Loughnan 279). The extent to which the paradox exists and the cognitions underpinning it are an important site of research. According to these scholars, CD helps to perceive and unpack our animal-centred paradoxes, and this is similarly the case for Hardy and his fictional agricultural industry.

Significantly, cognitive dissonance theory is also able to hypothesise and predict how individuals experience their inconsistencies and react when they have recognised them. This is useful in mapping the implications of Hardy's contradictory writing style. CD theory asserts that because the state of tension experienced is so uncomfortable, individuals seek to alleviate dissonance. In terms of the meat paradox this is typically by "altering one of the inconsistent elements... [either] attitudes towards meat or attitudes towards animals" (Loughnan et al. 156). Crucially, CD is a motivational state. Social psychologist Hank Rothgerber similarly undertakes the task of considering CD in relation to carnism, and builds upon scholarship exploring what has been termed "meat-related cognitive dissonance" (or MRCD). As Rothgerber posits, when the inherent inconsistency of carnism is presented to a meat-eater this prompts a CDS (1). The article seeks to further analyse the various "reduction mechanisms" that meat-eaters reach for when a CDS has been triggered (Rothgerber 2). These reactions range from reducing guilt by denigrating victims, to a change of dietary behaviour in order to protect victims from future harm (Rothgerber 2). The understanding of MRCD that Rothgerber highlights about the meat paradox helps this thesis to demonstrate the tension at the heart of Hardy's farms and moreover, what kind of reading experience the texts might achieve through their dissonant style.

The precedent for looking to psychology to unpack literature is vast. CD theory is one such example, with the phenomenon having been utilised by scholars seeking to understand disparate ideologies within texts. Such works demonstrate the revealing effect of CD upon both the actions of characters within texts and the impacts of the texts themselves as manifestations of CD states. This is the case for John Bird's 2016 article "And Then Think of Me!': *Huckleberry Finn* and Cognitive Dissonance." Here Bird argues that CD

explains what drives many of the characters and that more broadly the narrative's exploration of the human psyche aims to depict the CD of America's identity, one which is "founded on freedom" and yet built on slavery (148). Similarly Einat Natalie Palkovich argues in her analysis of mothers in children's literature that creating a CD state within texts—through techniques such as depicting mother characters as both kind and cruel—is a useful tool in expanding the perceptions of young readerships. For both Bird and Palkovich, CD can be used to interpret the conflicting ideologies which exist in narratives to therefore perceive new textual significance.

One final area to address before moving onto viewing Hardy himself and his works in light of CD theory, is any queries about the anachronistic application of the theory. While it is true that Festinger explored cognitive dissonance in the 1970s, a century after Hardy was writing novels, the phenomenon itself is not limited to 1975 and the years following. In his work Festinger seeks to form an understanding of an existing cognitive circumstance and its workings. Cognitive dissonance if viewed from another perspective is simply the clashing of ideals. It was of course possible for individuals to experience contradictory thoughts and the resulting tension before the condition itself was giving distinct terminology. Therefore, it is not unreasonable for a thoughtful man such as Hardy, who explores a relationship which is so plagued with contradiction (that between humans and nonhumans), to register and then depict dissonant cognitions. The fact that the term was coined and elucidated a century later only speaks to Hardy's powerful abilities of perceptiveness and self-reflection. Hardy's achievement is perhaps even more profound because he could not have relied upon cognitive dissonance theory to understand his own torment.

### Hardy's Dissonant Biography

As with the previous two chapters, I begin here by thinking about biographical evidence. I seek to establish that Hardy's biographies demonstrate his tendency to hold dissonant views and, when made aware of them, the capacity to experience an unpleasant tension. Aforementioned anecdotes illustrate Hardy's desire to treat animals with compassion yet

also his inability to consistently follow through on that desire. Facets of Hardy's identity betray contradictory perceptions of animal issues, such as an RSPCA representative and a drowner of kittens. Hardy both held conflicting views and created conflict between his views and his actions. There is perhaps no better example of this dissonance than in the anecdotes and memories which punctuate the last weeks of Hardy's life. The biography written by Florence Hardy notes that on his deathbed Hardy recalled an incident from his childhood in which he had picked up the body of a dead bird. The frailty and lightness of the nearly starved fieldfare haunted Hardy in such a way that it was still a vivid memory in his eighties (quoted in Millgate, *Life and Work* 479). Equally, in these same last weeks of his life, Hardy requested a meal of fried bacon as it held childhood nostalgia and comfort (Tomalin 368). When placed as adjacent, these episodes display Hardy's keen empathy for the feeling and physicality of animal bodies and yet also his keenness to slaughter and ingest them. While meat eating was certainly the norm in Victorian England and vegetarianism was characterised as extreme (Morrison, "Dickens" 56), there are examples of Victorian humanitarians who made dietary choices from a position of advocacy, such as Percy Bysshe Shelley and Mary Shelley (Armstrong 69). For a man such as Hardy who questioned using animals for transport, how they were butchered, and whether horses should be used in war, it is hard to credit that the question of carnism never entered into his mind. It is difficult to reconcile the tiny bird that haunted Hardy's compassionate imagination and the pig flesh in his mouth.

There is also evidence that certain dissonant cognitions were experienced by Hardy, and acted as triggers for CD states. The previously noted episode regarding struggling cart horses is a key example (*Life and Work* 159). Hardy is travelling via coach and despite noticing the suffering of the creatures pulling the vehicle he does not dismount. Hardy ponders upon his actions and finds they do not align with his beliefs. His musing is toned with regret and a note of suffering. As West writes, Hardy was "quietly haunted" by the working horses he encountered (168), and by his lack of action on their behalf. The author is led to speculate upon the actions of his first wife, someone he admired as being more proactive in her advocacy (West 166). In praising what he perceived her choice would have

been (to dismount) and regretting his own, Hardy arrives at a decision to change his future actions so they are more in line with his personal ethics (*Life and Work* 159). The discomfort of his emotional state is eased through consideration and change. Recognising what one ought to have done in a previous scenario is a response Rothgerber articulates (2). Significantly, instead of selecting the less burdensome response, to “strategically distort [ones] perceptions to reduce the moral guilt” (Rothgerber 2), Hardy, in a typically thoughtful move, notes the necessity of his own change. Cognitive dissonance, its framework, components, and effects, illuminates Hardy’s ethics around animals and his experience of those ethics. This is similarly true of his novels where the tensions innate to farming are dramatised, memorialised, and transmitted to his audience.

### The Dramatisation of Dissonance

There are numerous ways in which the novel’s two diverging discourses produce cognitive dissonance. The most basic is the narratives’ general inconsistencies, which the previous chapters elucidate. The fact that it is possible to point to scenes throughout the three narratives which present vastly different perceptions of livestock farming is evidence of dissonance. The close reading of the texts in Chapter Two of the thesis creates almost antithetical findings to that of Chapter Three. The way that their ideological stances clash is exemplified by incompatible portraits such as Gabriel’s lifesaving ministrations upon newborn lambs (*Madding Crowd* 88) and the nauseating excretions of Crick’s encumbered milchers (*Tess* 88). The images of Tess’s gentle fingers sweeping kindly over swollen udders (*Tess* 116) and the sense of interspecies kinship it manifests is impossible to reconcile with Jude’s fingers pulling a knife across the throat of a squealing pig (*Jude* 55). Hardy’s deeply, almost painfully, empathic portrayals of livestock displayed by Chapter Two differ intensely from the novels’ illustration of altruism’s self-destruction and ludicrousness, as shown by Chapter Three. It is unclear whether the novels fully endorse utilitarian or humanitarian treatments of animals, and in fact at varying moments seem to endorse each of them with equivalent vigour.

These thematic threads pull against one another in each of the novels and in the collection as a whole causing ontological strain and lingering unease. Much like an individual caught between two contradictory perceptions of self, Hardy's fiction is populated by irreconcilable ideologies, as if it does not quite know its own mind. To return once again to the image of the kaleidoscope, the utilitarian tones collide with the humanitarian hues to create vivid contrasts. The drastic and jarring colours of farming are not blended or married, but simply and dissonantly coexist. In fact, instead of attempting harmony, the texts take further steps to emphasise their discords. With CD theory forefront, and how it relates to animals, the following section illustrates the narrative techniques which seek to further the tension and create disharmony. Within the broader climate of incongruity, these strategies of articulation signal the tension even more strikingly. By examining the novels independently, I demonstrate how they each perform and accentuate the clash between discourses and the way in which that clash magnifies in intensity throughout Hardy's novel writing career.

### *Far From the Madding Crowd*

During a pivotal episode in *Madding Crowd*, the narrator muses upon the sudden loss of Gabriel's flock. In doing so, the narrative voice articulates the jarring ideas at the heart of Wessex farming. The episode comes about because an inexperienced sheepdog, Young George, has misconstrued his responsibilities and driven his master's sheep over a cliff. The text considers why the dog has done this and concludes that Young George has simply undertaken his herding work "too thoroughly" (33). What is significant is that the dog's attempt at thorough efficiency is in fact detrimental to the farming effort. Farming sheep is not about threatening sheep, nor is it even about protecting sheep, but in fact both. It is Young George's utter consistency—his lack of dissonant cognitions—which makes him so ill-suited to agricultural labours. Because of the misdeed the naive dog is "considered too good a workman to live" and is shot by Gabriel (33). When the narrator reflects on the dog's bleak fate, it is described as one which "so often attends dogs and other philosophers who follow out a train of reasoning to its logical conclusion, and attempt perfectly consistent

conduct in a world made up so largely of compromise” (33-4). No doubt Hardy thought it humorously incongruous to pair dogs and philosophers but beyond this, the way the narrator deals with the incident creates an allegorical relationship between sheep herding and philosophy, between farming and ethics. Moreover, bad ends come to all those, canine and clever, who see only uniformity. Here the word “compromise” suggests a necessary recognition of nuance but also a reluctant release of ideals. Hardy implies that in the same way that philosophers cannot reasonably assume perpetual coherence to their theories, agriculturalists like the young dog cannot reasonably enact a single-minded relationship to their sheep. Successful philosophers must avoid absolutism to reach a nuanced ideology and farmers must avoid absolute care or utter objectification to enact their duplicitous role effectively. There is an unavoidable “compromise” in the doctrines of both thinkers and farmers, one which becomes burdensome to those desiring harmonious consistency of thought. Agriculture relies upon protection then slaughter, compassion and then utilisation, herding livestock away from the cliff and then directly towards it.

In this same scene, the real burden of agriculture’s necessary ethical compromise is then experienced by Gabriel himself. Having seen his ewes heaped at the bottom of the cliff Gabriel enters a state of anger at the loss of capital they represent but even more acutely he feels deep grief for them as living beings (33). In order to explain the obvious irony of feeling pity for the death of livestock inevitably bound for the butcher, the narrator explains that Gabriel is a “very humane man” and that a “shadow on his life had always been that his flock ended in mutton” (33). The shepherd characterises himself as an “arrant traitor” to his sheep. The phrase “shadow on his life” signals much here, particularly in the context of the preceding episode. A foreboding darkness and unsettling presence casts shade over Gabriel’s very existence. The shepherd is always traitorous in his dealings. The phrase serves to juxtapose the animals, meek and mild, with their brutal deceiver. In a moment of sharp and sudden contrast, the relationship between human and nonhuman converts drastically from life extension to life extinction, leaving the sheep, Gabriel, and the narrative tainted by incongruity. The two components of his identity—carer and betrayer, humanitarian and utilitarian—are irreconcilable, causing him substantial inner conflict. The

dissonance here is even more forceful because it exists within perhaps the most pastoral tale of Hardy's oeuvre. Even within the sometimes idyllic Weatherbury landscape and its kindly shepherds, a deep and irreconcilable unease lives at the core of animal agriculture. Gabriel cannot and does not ever overcome his cognitive dissonance. This incident's framing by the narrator articulates Hardy's experience of dissonance in considering ethics, farming, and the ethics of farming. The unease signalled in *Madding Crowd* that Gabriel exhibits does not, however, dominate the narrative. Gabriel farms animals for the entirety of the novel, rising up to become a bailiff of two farms. Significantly, the tension this novel dramatises in the above scene is renewed and explored with greater strength in *Tess*.

### *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*

The same shadow that Gabriel experiences similarly marks Tess's life. In this novel, the dissonance is heightened through characterisation and articulated in an important scene of creaturely suffering. The humanitarian instincts and yet utilitarian inclinations that characterise Hardy and Wessex farming can also be found, quite surprisingly, in the characterisation of his heroine. Dissonant cognitions exist at the centre of Tess's psyche. Her dissonance lives in her perception of vulnerable creatures. Throughout the narrative Tess displays compassion for vulnerable characters (human and nonhuman) and yet this is juxtaposed drastically with how she views and treats herself. In Tess's worldview vulnerable creatures and those having been exploited or wronged deserve pity, and yet she perceives herself as deserving only punishment or at best pure survival. To pitiful animals Tess displays stunning humanitarianism, while to herself she grants only utility. Expressions of this contradiction occur throughout the text. Because Tess is so allied with animality throughout the novel, as I have previously explored, the reader is encouraged to perceive Tess herself as a vulnerable creature, one who deserves all the same pity as this group. If CD is the tension created by incompatible cognitions then Tess provides a perfect model of this in her inconsistent application of her own ethics. Importantly, while Gabriel dwells upon the shadow caused by CD, Tess never fully recognises her own dissonance nor

how it has impact on her life. It is through her paradoxical behaviours and the perceptive narratological voice that we see Tess's CD.

To begin first with the heroine's characterisation, Tess's humanitarian instincts are demonstrated by a great number of instances including her affinity for the milchers (116), her altruistic acceptance of Angel's brutal requests (169), and her pained reaction to Prince's death (27). Tess feels the horse Prince's demise so acutely that she responds viscerally, experiencing the accident, as West describes it, "on a basic level of shared embodiment" (148). She is such as beacon of kindness that Linda Shires perceives her character as faultless, noting "her sheer excellence as a human being." ("The Radical Aesthetic" 229). Equally, there are numerous occasions where Tess's utilitarianism is highlighted. Prince's death provides clarity here also when Tess's response to the crisis is to rely upon her own utility. When the horse has been killed and the family is left reeling, Tess takes on the burden of setting the situation right and allows herself to be sent off to the d'Urberville estate. As West argues, Tess sees it as her duty to replace the horse's loss with her own industry, and fails to see her own 'unsubstitutable singularity' (West 165). Tess's compassion towards animals is borne of a sense of kinship with them, and this kinship leads to her own dehumanisation. Tess allows herself to become a replacement for a cart-horse. There is a similar process of exchange enacted at the end of the novel when Tess is to be hanged and she encourages Angel to marry her younger sister Liza-Lou (326). In these instances a part which has become useless to the cause is replaced with another more suitable one and the greater good is achieved. This same sense is articulated even more strongly in the period after Tess has given birth to her child and begins working as a labourer in the fields. Tess considers her situation and potential future and decides "she would do well to be useful again" (77). Her desires do not stretch to happiness or good fortune but the more humble realm of purpose. Meadowsong highlights the utility which oncoming modernity and industrialisation thrusts upon Tess. When working at Flint-Comb Ash, for example, Tess must tend the mechanical threshing machine, a role which jolts her body with vibrations and is extremely strenuous (276). The machine is described by Meadowsong as both "inhuman in its strength and dehumanizing to those who tend it"

(234), its mechanisation demanding a physical exertion from Tess as simply a component of its larger structure. In this violent image Tess is made to be a cog in the larger wheel of modernity, her welfare and happiness lost beneath the grander purpose of productivity. Tess utilises herself and allows herself to be utilised, even replaced, for the sake of a perceived greater good.

Arguably the great tragedy of *Tess* is that the heroine's admirable humanitarian impulse—her desire for the welfare of others—does not extend to herself. While vicious forces undoubtedly exert control over Tess and unfortunate events continually befall her, Tess's own choices exacerbate these misfortunes. She consistently disallows her own success out of a sense of deserving only peril and punishment. There has been a tendency in criticism of the novel to look beyond Tess to find the real actors of the novel. Boumelha for instance notes Tess's recurring status as unconscious when the major events of the plot occur (such as Prince's death, her rape, and her arrest at Stonehenge) (*Thomas Hardy and Women* 121), while Meadowsong points to larger industrial processes as the key drivers of action, modernisation pushing Tess between events like a steam train (236). In these assessments, Tess's agency is overpowered or underused, however, it is possible to perceive the events of the novel and the heroine's role in them quite differently if reading with CD in mind. When the deep contradiction of humanitarian and utilitarian ideals within Tess are exposed, her role in her own fate is highlighted and her self-abasement more recognisable. As the narrator notes very early on in Tess's sorrows "she made herself miserable the livelong night and day" (77), the vast majority of her suffering "generated by her conventional aspect, and not by her innate sensations" (ibid). Perhaps the most agonising result of the unresolved CD in *Tess* is that the heroine is a traitor to herself. The ultimate dissonance of the novel is that Tess is a "pure woman" who expresses great altruism to other beings, and yet she is tarnished and blamed and doomed, mostly by her own sense of guilt.

Tess's characterisation in the novel and what it means for Hardy's perception of animals and their plight is expressed in further clarity in a scene towards the end of the

narrative. The cognitive dissonance of Tess's views is epitomised in a scene in which Tess is rambling through the countryside towards a new situation and stumbles upon some dead and dying game birds. Part of what makes the scene so poignant is the way in which Hardy threads connections between Tess and the creatures which then serves to emphasise the shocking disparity between how Tess treats them and herself. There are three key points about this event which are crucial to understanding how humanitarian-utilitarian dissonance operates and what it suggests about livestock animals. Firstly, the birds in the scene are pictured as part of the group of species domesticated by humans. The pheasants have been shot by a shooting-party and have hidden themselves in the boughs of nearby trees to avoid being picked up by the gamekeepers. Hardy signals the unnatural circumstances of this hunting event when he describes the "bloodthirsty" gunmen who "brought into being [the birds] by artificial means solely to gratify these propensities" (232). Like livestock, the pheasants have been bred and kept by human hands for the sake of human endeavours. In this situation it is less the product of the animals' bodies that is useful and more the experience of dispatching them which is the ultimate goal, leading Hardy to label its actors "so unmannerly and so unchivalrous towards their weaker fellows in Nature's teeming family" (232). The avian bodies are only a matter of entertainment, much like the pig's phallus Arabella launches at Jude during their first encounter. The identification of the birds as under human control is furthered by the responsibility that the narrative and situation seem to force onto Tess, and Cohn argues this depiction is part of Hardy's broader narrative strategy of demonstrating the human responsibility to protect nonhuman others (Cohn 517). The injured pheasants are domesticated and exploited animals suffering at the hands of human brutality.

The identity of the perpetrators in the scene is the second significant detail. The killer of the pheasants creates an association between the attack upon the feathered victims that is enacted upon the heroine of the narrative. Game birds and shooting-parties exist in the landscape of only one class in Tess's Wessex, that of the landed gentry. These men are what Hardy describes as "quite civil persons save during certain weeks of autumn and winter" (232), or in other words those normally associated with decorum and propriety. It

is this same class of person who causes Tess's misery. Tess and the birds are groomed and abused by members of the gentry, lured into relationships of supposed care and subsequently attacked. Both Tess and the pheasants are gentle species manipulated for the sake of base pleasures. The suggestion exists here that the violence suffered as a result of Alec's assault is akin to that enacted on livestock. The scene depicts two groups that Victorian culture perceived as domestic creatures (women and game for hunting) who experience brutal traumas at the hands of the powerful.

Lastly, this relationship points to further meanings existing within the subtext of the episode, which are illuminated by Tess's reaction to the birds. When Tess sees the birds her immediate response is characteristic pity for their plight, yet simultaneously she feels disgust and humiliation for herself. Tess, "[w]ith the impulse of a soul who could feel for kindred sufferers as much as for herself" (232), puts the injured birds out of their misery. In helping them and crying for them she exclaims with regret "to suppose myself the most miserable being on earth in the sight o' such misery as yours!" (ibid) and becomes "ashamed of herself for her gloom of the night" (ibid). The narrator uses an intriguing turn of phrase to describe this act noting that Tess "killed the birds tenderly" (233). Tess sees her role in the situation as doing what is required to alleviate pain, despite the distress it may cause herself. The birds are gently dispatched while Tess survives and suffers. The altruism of her act has no benefits to Tess's psyche nor does their pitiful state arouse any sense of allegiance. Ironically their suffering only extends her own inner turmoil by adding further guilt to its composition. Throughout the scene the novel allies Tess with the feathered fatalities while Tess sees only difference.

The painful irony of the scene is further heightened by another episode at the beginning of the novel which echoes this latter one very closely. In this first iteration the pregnant Tess wanders through the woods at night in order to have some exercise but remain away from the gaze of her neighbours. In doing so, she wanders past "sleeping birds", "skipping rabbits" (72) and under a "pheasant-laden bough" (73). Tess finds that despite the curing qualities of the nature around her she cannot allow herself to enjoy the

scene because she perceives herself as tainting it with her disgrace. However, the narrator emphatically notes that “all the while she was making a distinction where there was no difference. Feeling herself in antagonism she was quite in accord” (73). The discord Tess conjures between herself and other animals is a prevalent theme, one which jars against the actual kinship readers perceive. Frustratingly, instead of offering herself pity, Tess stumbles on towards a bleak finale, and ultimately is hanged, ending in a way that is not dissimilar from the drooping pheasants’ bodies in the trees about her. In this graphic and disturbing episode of injured creatures, the disparity between Tess’s humanitarian instincts and utilitarian self-perception is dramatised. The tense atmosphere created is tragic, dramatic, and heavily ironic. It becomes frustrating to read. Because the two discourses are so united in this one character and expressed in this scene, the novel forces to the forefront the clash between them. The tension between Tess’s inconsistent choices is perhaps even more frustrating here because it is the human, not the animal, who bears the brunt of the utilitarian ideology. Crucially, Tess embodies a position which is likely comparable to that of the reader themselves - a state of enacting dissonant cognitions around animals but unaware of their own discord.

### *Jude the Obscure*

From Gabriel who acknowledges his dissonance but does not let it dominate his life, to Tess who never recognises these contradictions which are in fact at the core of her existence, we come lastly to Jude who not only experiences dissonance, but is tormented by it. While it might be surprising to Hardy’s readers to consider Tess as enacting CD, it will be no shock to scholars of Hardy to consider either *Jude* the novel or Jude the character in this way. In the two other novels, the expressions of CD are more abstract, episodic, and sub-textual. *Jude the Obscure* brings these nebulous manifestations to a point, and dramatises the dissonant discourses more ubiquitously and prominently. This is because the phenomenon is personified by the protagonist. This positioning of Jude’s dissonant identity is best understood within a broader landscape of the novel’s conflicting ideas.

In fact, CD is not confined to Jude's character but pervades the entire text. So many parts of the narrative are about dissonance and consonance, disparity then connection, ideas shifting, sometimes reconciling, often breaking apart and being renegotiated. Other scholars have noted *Jude's* preoccupation with contradiction. Patricia Ingham raises what she calls the "turbulent contradictory views" Hardy presents on three key focuses of the novel - patriarchy, feminine identities, and education (xii). Sue and Jude are the central actors in these thematic explorations, and both demonstrate ideologies utterly at odds with their previous mentalities (Ingham xxi). Ingham posits that it may well be because of these contradictions that the novel makes such a powerful statement about contemporary injustices (ibid). Jude's outward renunciation of the institutions that reject him and yet inner desire for their patronage is a site of conflict, while Sue's staunch intellectual rejection of convention does not marry up with her ultimate conformity (Ingham xxi). The disconnect between thought and action, and between incompatible thoughts, is a jarring and frustrating characteristic of the novel in general. Though contradictory ideas permeate *Jude*, they are not often characterised in terms of cognitive dissonance. One brief exception to this statement is Sara Lyons' essay "Thomas Hardy and the Value of Brains" which reads Jude's conflicted ideologies around education as a "devastating kind of cognitive dissonance" in the way he adhered to beliefs about the biological determination of intelligence and also lauded autodidactic possibilities (347). Another fleeting reference to the phenomenon occurs in West's analysis when she notes the CD between Sue's adamant reduction of her own bodily desires and her intimacy with Jude (42). What these minor mentions signal is the broader usefulness of cognitive dissonance's terminology in understanding *Jude*.

Moreover, CD is present and poignant in the way animal discourses are articulated by the novel. *Jude's* protagonist experiences CD so acutely that it bleeds into the plot, themes, and entire ontology of the narrative. Jude's CD is rooted in the fact that he desires to only ever act humanely towards creatures (as explored in Chapter Two), yet is equally aware of the futility and impracticality of these desires (as explored in Chapter Three). Jude is driven to protect all creatures but ultimately contributes to their butchery. To flesh out

this idea, it is worth returning once again to the pig-killing scene. This is where the two cognitions clash most brutally. As West points out, the diction of the episode highlights the opposing forces at action, such as between “work and mercy” (132), between pragmatism and kindness. It is in this scene that Jude is forced to choose between the two poles and the compulsion towards each of them is exposed in his character. His utilitarian proclivities are expressed throughout the process of readying the tools and the pig for butchery (54). However, from the very onset of the process Jude experiences misgivings. His humanitarian instincts cannot help but surface. Jude regrets having to boil the water that will scorch the pig’s skin (ibid), rejects Arabella’s assertion that they must let the pig bleed out slowly (55), and experiences acute discomfort during the entire episode. He does manage to navigate into somewhat of a middle ground in that he slaughters the animal in a more humane way than Arabella desires, and standard butchery practice would dictate. However this is by no means a comfortable position in which Jude finds himself, instead it seems to be the worst of both worlds. Both the text and Jude emphasise the “inherent contradiction” of attempting to enact a humane slaughter (West 132). The scene brings to a head the internal paradox Jude has been experiencing since his youth and forces him to accept the utilitarian nature of existence for the rural Victorian poor. This depressing ontology is first articulated during the episode in which Jude is hired as a scarecrow but instead allows the rooks to feed in the field. The narrator notes here that “Nature’s logic was too horrid for him to care for. That mercy towards one set of creatures was cruelty towards another sickened his sense of harmony” (17). The natural logic of his world is not compatible, and can never achieve harmony, with his innate desire to be kind. In scenes like the pig killing it is possible to watch Jude’s CD in action, when both the humanitarian beliefs and the utilitarian ones are cognitively and viscerally truthful to Jude. In this novel the conflict between perceptions of animals is a site of deep psychological trauma for the protagonist. In no other Hardy novel is the protagonist so wedded to compassion as a state of being and yet the brutality of their world so concrete.

What is most noteworthy about the CD tension in *Jude* is its inescapability. At the close of the pig-killing the narrator notes that Jude “could not see how the matter was to be

mended" (57). The protagonist, much like Hardy himself, sees no reasonable way to act differently in his situation. The triumph of one facet of Jude's character, despite oppositions from other facets, is a theme throughout the work. For example, Jude longs to be a man of education and respectability but is undermined by his tendency to drink. As part of the battles between his desires the novel acknowledges his tendency towards the easier of any two pursuits, stating for instance that "the human was more powerful in him than the Divine" (170), and that Jude "was obliged to own to himself that his conscience was likely to be the loser in this battle" (83). His relationship with animals is certainly an example of this pattern. It seems impossible for him to avoid the baser parts of his identity and the pragmatic realities of rural poverty. The resounding tension of this state becomes unsurvivable. It is an insurmountable ethical paradox. West, in exploring Sue's CD—her simultaneous sexuality and asexuality (West 42)—notes that the tension is "never resolved, leading to tragic consequences" (West 42). The same can be said of Jude's experience of dissonance. The protagonist dies alone in his bed having never truly resolved whether he is a man of learning or ill repute, whether he is truly Sue's husband or Arabella's, whether he should have killed the pig or freed it. In fact Jude reminisces upon the pig-killing episode on his deathbed. He says to Arabella, "I have been thinking of my foolish feeling about the pig you and I killed during our first marriage. I feel now that the greatest mercy that could be vouchsafed to me would be that something should serve me as I served that animal" (313). His own compassion has become ludicrous to him, a "foolish feeling", and yet there is still an altruistic impulse innate in the way he speaks about the pig, as if by killing it he is saving it from a worse fate. Jude's nihilistic and suicidal aspect here fulfills a fate the text had always predicted. In the second chapter of the novel the narrator muses upon Jude's altruism, stating "[t]his weakness of character, as it may be called, suggested that he was the sort of man who was born to ache a good deal before the fall of the curtain upon his unnecessary life" (16). When the curtain does fall he is certainly aching, and his end is a welcome release from life upon what Tess so accurately calls a "blighted" star (25) - a world not suited to humanitarian ideals.

In fact, none of the novels overcome these tensions. For each of the protagonists, the way they desire to treat nonhumans compassionately comes into conflict with their actual treatment of animal bodies as objects. While this manifests in different ways in the different texts, its shape appears throughout the three novels, a gloomy figure haunting Wessex and its creatures which grows and looms ever more menacingly until the end of Hardy's career as a novelist. The growth of cognitive dissonance in the novels and its shift from underlying discomfort to existential dread is part of a broader shift in style, particularly in relation to representations of animals. In Chapter Two I looked to Elisha Cohn's research in order to better consider the way Hardy expresses humanitarian feelings towards farm animals. Cohn articulates the way Hardy's fictional animals change during the author's novel writing career from species akin to humans to species more vulnerable and less capable than humans, in order for the texts to therefore emphasise human responsibility. Alongside the increased species separation which facilitates humanitarian ideas and an increase in the humanitarian ideology itself, there is simultaneously an increased perception of his world's utilitarianism. The change in representation is a map of Hardy's own torment and his inability to bridge irreconcilable beliefs, and perhaps most importantly, can be read as an attempt to memorialise his own conflict. The tension hangs in his novels, like carcasses at the slaughterhouse, unresolved and uncomfortable to read.

### The Role of the Reader

The audience of the novels is prompted to perceive dissonance and, just like the characters, is likely to similarly suffer a state of tension. The world of Wessex agriculture that the reader steps into becomes so plagued by the inconsistency of representations it is difficult to avoid. Part of experiencing this state is the desire to ease it. As elucidated above, the alleviation of CD can take various forms, from total avoidance of triggers to a complete change of beliefs. In the case of meat-related cognitive dissonance, researchers emphasise that prevalent responses include reframing animals as objects or meat as divorced from animals, undermining moral judgements regarding animals, or simply not engaging in the conflicting behaviour by avoiding the consumption of animal products (Panagiotou and

Kadianaki 236). Thus meat-related CD can lead directly to ethics-focused decision making. Hardy likely knew this from his own experience. The way the novels dramatise CD encourages the same process for his readers. It is reasonable to assume that Victorian readers were capable of recognising much of themselves in the way the texts and the characters experience CD, that they were fascinated by the individual identities of the cows in *Tess* and horrified by the inhumane butchery of *Jude's* pig, but like the characters also consume animal products. Hardy draws readers into the uncomfortable state of tension, refuses to resolve that tension, and ultimately leaves the reader as the only actor enabled to ease it. If the CD tension created by the texts is ever to be eased the reader must intellectually engage with the paradox itself.

In making this argument about the role of the reader in Hardy's fiction, I build upon similar stances by other scholars. Returning again to Boumelha, the author argues in relation to Hardy's portrayal of female characters that because of the clashing ideologies inherent in his ideas of femininity, the reader "may be called upon" to navigate the conflict and make sense of it (*Thomas Hardy and Women* 6). In a similar vein, Shires posits that Hardy's insertion of incompatible ideas, in his characterisation of Fanny Robin for instance, leaves the reader the "job" of accepting or managing them ("And I Was Unaware" 38). Correspondingly, West furthers Shires's analysis in her assertion that the reader must "grapple with or ignore" the paradoxes (100). All of these scholars of Hardy understand his unstable ideologies as enlisting the input of the reader. What CD theory is able to open up here is the kind of input likely to be motivated and what that might achieve. Theories demonstrate the high likelihood of readers undergoing some method of dissonance reduction; in West's words 'grappling' instead of ignoring the issue. The theoretical analyses signal the chance of that reaction being behavioural change and real ethical reevaluation. Through their uncomfortable balancing of incongruous ideas, the texts are able to encourage progression in a subtle, lingering, and affecting manner. The motivational tension of CD is, arguably, far more powerful and stimulating than earnest didacticism could ever be.

## Evolutionary Expectations

However, while the reader is certainly prompted to further consideration by the texts, it is likely that the conundrums they present would prove similarly insurmountable to a Victorian reader as it was to Hardy and his characters. Hardy could not reasonably expect his contemporaries to unpack an ethical paradox he himself was unable to overcome. Thus it is important to note that his texts, in their presentation of inescapable CD, also assume societal progress. Hardy's texts demonstrate a belief in evolutionary meliorism. Scholars such as Suzanne Keen and Caroline Sumpter have explored how Hardy's narratives demonstrate a hope and expectation of human progress. Keen shows that for Hardy, sympathy for others was the "fundamental ingredient of his self-declared 'evolutionary meliorism'" (360), and similarly Sumpter notes that feeling for the plight of others was the core of Hardy's "tentative hope" for future generations (683). Meliorism is the clearest way to marry Hardy's often bleak and nihilistic narratives with the optimistic identity he presented to his readers and interviewers. Hardy's perception of his work as a deeply ethical pursuit, his books, in his words "but one plea" for compassion (quoted in Millgate, *Thomas Hardy* 379), exhibits this expectation of ethical betterment. The way his novels expose the reader to ideological tension and ethical conundrums should be seen as part of this effort.

Hardy had high hopes for the future and sought to accelerate movement towards it. This is a characterisation of the author perhaps at odds with his traditional identity as a writer who revelled in a pre-industrial golden age, but is an important component of both his authorial persona and writing. His melioristic perspective equally applies to his perception of animal issues. In a letter to his friend and fellow advocate Florence Henniker, Hardy expresses his excitement at the prospect of new technology which can alleviate animal suffering. He writes "Driving up Regent St in the rain one day... I met an electric omnibus, & it seemed a joyful presage of the future" (*Collected Letters* II 150). For Hardy, modernity's science could enable "social reform" for both human and nonhuman creatures alike (West 168). Part of his plea for progress is certainly his conflicted depiction of

farming. Because the author and the texts assume progress, there is also a sense in works like *Jude* that the compassionate and progressive characters are simply born in the wrong time, as Sue says, that they are “a little beforehand, that’s all” (*Jude* 233). Here Sue speaks of her and Jude’s anxiety around matrimony and the cage it seems to represent to them, but the sentiment is equally relevant to the many other injustices the novel depicts. The societal pressure to conform to matrimonial norms which Sue laments, seems just as inescapable to the characters as the animal utilisation they exercise, and in both cases their present society is not equipped to allow movement away from convention and tradition and towards more universal compassion. The conflict such a conundrum produces is dramatised, emphasised, and disseminated, by the three novels and their masterful creation of cognitive dissonance states, ones that are likely to encourage the very progress the author sought.

## Chapter Five: Coda

For Wessex farming, compassion can only be the precursor to carnism and the most well-meaning benevolence invariably begets butchery. This duplicity is central, even crucial, to the agriculture's identity within Hardy's novels. Gabriel is a traitor to his sheep; Tess—an exploited creature—is a traitor to herself; and Jude lives and eventually dies in a painfully traitorous world. The fourth chapter of this thesis sought to demonstrate how the inconsistency of the farming industry is best understood as mimicking the incongruities of cognitive dissonance and similarly the resulting state of tension. The tension of animal agriculture's dual identity is bothersome, irreconcilable, and most of all, motivational. It may be the folly of "dogs and other philosophers" (*Madding Crowd* 33) to seek consonance in a complicated world, and yet that is what the characters strive for, a comfortable continuity between what they believe and how they act, a deeply relatable desire. Through this narrative technique, Hardy's readers perceive the violent contradictions facilitated by the farming of animals, and are encouraged to discern their own paradoxes surrounding nonhumans, ultimately as a means to engagement with animal issues. This thesis has aimed to show that in considering Hardy's livestock—their complex images, complicated characterisations, and the ethical considerations involved in their husbandry—much becomes apparent. Through identifying and then deconstructing the discourses that structure his illustrations, plus analysing their forceful conflict, Hardy's cryptic portrayal of animal farming becomes legible and the mechanisms of Hardy's complex advocacy for nonhumans is revealed. The character of these "Novels of Character and Environment" is shown to be inciting, challenging, and perhaps most surprisingly, optimistic.

The thesis' illumination of this component of Hardy's fiction has implications on current knowledge and highlights areas for future research. Through an animal-centred analysis of this author's writings it is possible to see pre-modern farms, Victorian human-animal relations, and the author himself, in new clarity. Understanding Hardy and his authorial achievements more thoroughly, while valuable in its own right to scholars of literary and Victorian studies, has the added benefit of establishing methods for articulating

and disseminating animal issues in all their ethical complexity. From Hardy's work we gain a broader understanding of the potential techniques that authors who are engaged with animal issues might utilise in their expressions of ideas and explorations of their own perceptions. Pondering the plight of nonhumans, and the violent paradoxes we enact in their utilisation, is a process the thesis seeks to analyse, complicate, and advocate. The novel I have written for the creative component is inspired by Hardy's engagement with animal issues and the literary techniques he utilises. Like Hardy's work, my novel is dedicated to a particular pastoral landscape and the creatures within it. It is a novel about heritage, creatures, and love; three nouns that can similarly be used to describe preoccupations of Hardy's fiction. The creative component further explores the ethical problems and paradoxes highlighted by Hardy and reinforced by the research journey articulated above.

There is further progress to be made beyond the goals of the thesis. In terms of Hardy scholarship there is much ground still to be traversed regarding domesticated animals and the discourses which structure their depictions. Agricultural animals appear throughout the vast oeuvre of novels and poetry penned by the author and whilst not as prominent in these texts as in the ones explored above, there is certainly potential for a collective study of their agricultural content. Additionally, as part of understanding Hardy's animal ideologies, and particularly regarding animal utilisations, there is much to be gained from further analysis of Hardy's equine characters. Horses populate the novels explored in this thesis and have key roles in many others of note, such as *A Pair of Blue Eyes* (1873) and *The Woodlanders* (1887). Whilst outside the scope of this PhD, horses in Hardy's work conform to the dual discourses discussed, including both the necessity of their bodies for transportation and their role as empathetic individuals in the texts. There is also scope for the two discourses I have highlighted to be further mapped in the context of Hardy's writing beyond the animal into human realms such as amorous relationships. More broadly, there is real potential to uncover how conflicting discourses around animals permeate other fiction of the Victorian era and onwards in order to better understand the figurative character of our relationship with animals and the ideologies that structure it. Through a

continued assessment of how we perceive and depict using animal bodies, scholarship can encourage robust and influential discussions that precipitate brighter multi-species futures.

## References

### Works Cited

- Amato, Sarah. *Beastly Possessions: Animals in Victorian Consumer Culture*. University of Toronto Press, 2015.
- Armstrong, Philip. *What Animals Mean in the Fiction of Modernity*. Routledge, 2008.
- Babb, Howard. "Setting and Theme in *Far from the Madding Crowd*." *ELH*, vol. 30, no. 2, 1963, pp. 147–161. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2872087](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2872087)
- Bastian, Brock, and Steve Loughnan. "Resolving the Meat-Paradox: A Motivational Account of Morally Troublesome Behavior and Its Maintenance." *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, vol. 21, no. 3, 2017, pp. 278–299. *Sage*, doi:10.1177/1088868316647562.
- Beer, Gillian. *Darwin's Plots: Evolutionary Narrative in Darwin, George Eliot, and Nineteenth Century Fiction*. Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1983.
- Berger, John. "Why Look at Animals?" *About Looking*, Vintage Book, 1991, pp. 3-28.
- Bird, John. "'And Then Think of Me!': Huckleberry Finn and Cognitive Dissonance." *The Mark Twain Annual*, vol. 14, 2016, pp. 139-149. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/marktwaij.14.1.0138>
- Boumelha, Penny. "A 'Double Tragedy.'" *Jude the Obscure: Third Norton Critical Edition*, edited by Ralph Pite, 2016, pp. 399-408.
- . *Thomas Hardy and Women: Sexual Ideology and Narrative Form*. The Harvest Press, 1982.
- Brady, Kristin. "Thomas Hardy and Matters of Gender." *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hardy*, edited by Dale Kramer, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 93–111. *Cambridge Companions to Literature*, <https://doi-org.virtual.anu.edu.au/10.1017/CCOL0521562023.006>
- Bronte, Emily. *Wuthering Heights*. Penguin Classics, 2008.
- Carroll, Alicia. "Human Milk in the Modern World: Breastfeeding and the Cult of the Dairy in *Adam Bede* and *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*." *Women's Studies*, vol. 31, 2002, pp 165-197. *Taylor and Francis Online*, DOI: [10.1080/00497870212953](https://doi.org/10.1080/00497870212953)

Claire Tomalin. *Thomas Hardy: The Time Torn Man*. Penguin Press, 2007.

Cohen, Mathilde. "Animal Colonialism: The Case of Milk." *American Journal of International Law Unbound*, vol. 111, 2017, pp. 267-271. *Cambridge Core*, <https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/american-journal-of-international-law/article/animal-colonialism-the-case-of-milk/85D23B7D58EE049CE3AF2788B57838BC>

Cohn, Elisha. "No Insignificant Creature: Thomas Hardy's Ethical Turn." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 64, iss. 4, 2010, pp. 494-520. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ncl.2010.64.4.494](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ncl.2010.64.4.494).

Cole, Matthew. "From 'Animal Machines' to 'Happy Meat'? Foucault's Ideas of Disciplinary and Pastoral Power Applied to 'Animal-Centred' Welfare Discourse." *Animals*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2011, pp. 83-101. *Proquest*, doi: 10.3390/ani1010083

Danielson, Stentor. "Utilitarianism." *Green Ethics and Philosophy: An A-to-Z Guide*, edited by Julie Newman, SAGE Publications, 2011, pp. 425-7. *ProQuest Ebook Central*, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/lib/anu/detail.action?docID=1995298>.

Darwin, Charles. *The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex*. Penguin, 2004.

---. *The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animals*. Harper Collins, 1999.

---. *On the Origin of Species*. Faber and Faber, 1979.

Derrida, Jacques, and David Wills. "The Animal That Therefore I Am (More to Follow)." *Critical Inquiry*, vol. 28, no. 2, 2002, pp. 369-418. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/1344276](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1344276).

Dickens, Charles. *Great Expectations*. Penguin, 1965.

Elliot, Andrew J., and Patricia G. Devine. "On the Motivational Nature of Cognitive Dissonance: Dissonance as Psychological Discomfort." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 67, 1994, pp. 382-94. *APA PsychNet*, <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.3.382>.

Festinger, Leon. *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*. Row, Peterson and Company, 1957.

Foucault, Michel. *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the College de France, 1977-78*. Edited by Michel Sennelart, Palsgrave Macmillan, 2007.

Frey, R. G. "Utilitarianism and Animals." *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Ethics*, edited by Tom L. Beauchamp and R. G. Frey, Oxford University Press, 2011, pp. 173-197.

Fudge, Erica. *Animal*. Reaktion, 2002.

---. "A Left-Handed Blow: Writing the History of Animals." *Representing Animals: Theories of Contemporary Culture*, edited by Nigel Rothfels, Indiana University Press, 2002, pp. 3-18. *University of Strathclyde*, <https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/29540/>

Gigliotti, Carol. "The Struggle for Compassion and Justice through Critical Animal Studies." *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies*, edited by Linda Kalof Kalof, Oxford University Press, 2014. *Oxford Handbooks Online*, <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199927142.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199927142>.

Greiner, D. R. "Thinking of Me Thinking of You: Sympathy Versus Empathy in the Realist Novel." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 53, no. 3, 2011, pp. 417-426. *ProQuest*, <https://www-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/scholarly-journals/thinking-me-you-sympathy-versus-empathy-realist/docview/887756544/se-2?accountid=8330>.

Hamilton, Sue. "Dog's Homes and Lethal Chambers, or, What Was it Like to be a Battersea Dog?" *Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture: Contexts for Criticism*, edited by Laurence W. Mazzeno and Ronald D. Morrison, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 83-108.

Hardy, Florence. *The Later Years of Thomas Hardy, 1892-1928*. Macmillan, 1930.

Hardy, Thomas. "The Dorsetshire Labourer." *Longman's Magazine*, vol. 2, iss. 9, 2012, pp. 252-270. *Proquest*, <https://www.proquest.com/docview/6341877?pq-origsite=summon&accountid=8330>.

---. *The Collected Letters of Thomas Hardy*. Edited by Richard Purdy and Michael Millgate, Clarendon Press, 1978-1988.

---. *Far from the Madding Crowd: Norton Critical Edition*. Edited by Robert C. Schweik, W. W. Norton and Company, 1986.

---. *Jude the Obscure: Third Norton Critical Edition*. Edited by Ralph Pite, W. W. Norton and Company, 1978.

---. *The Life and Work of Thomas Hardy*. Edited by Michael Millgate, Macmillan, 1984.

---. *The Mayor of Casterbridge: Second Norton Critical Edition*. Edited by Phillip Mallet, W. W. Norton, 1977.

- . *A Pair of Blue Eyes*. Penguin, 1998.
- . *The Personal Notebooks of Thomas Hardy*. Edited by Richard H. Taylor, Macmillan, 1978.
- . *Tess of the d'Urbervilles: Second Norton Critical Edition*. Edited by Scott Elledge, W. W. Norton Company, 1965.
- . *Thomas Hardy's Public Voice: the Essays, Speeches, and Miscellaneous Prose*. Edited by Michael Millgate, Oxford University Press, 2001.
- . *Two on a Tower*. Penguin, 2012.
- . *The Woodlanders*. Penguin, 1986.
- Harrison, Ruth. *Animal Machines*. Vincent Stuart Publishers, 1964.
- Hassett, Michael E. "Compromised Romanticism in *Jude the Obscure*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 25, no. 4, 1971, pp. 432–443. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2933121](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2933121).
- Hendrick, George. *Henry Salt, Humanitarian Reformer and Man of Letters*. University of Illinois Press, 1977.
- Henson, Eithne. *Landscape and Gender in the Novels of Charlotte Bronte, George Eliot, and Thomas Hardy: The Body of Nature*. Ashgate, 2011.
- Herman, David. *Narratology Beyond the Human: Storytelling and Animal Life*. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Holland, Norman. "*Jude the Obscure*: Hardy's Symbolic Indictment of Christianity." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 9, no. 1, 1954, pp. 50–60. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/3044291](http://www.jstor.org/stable/3044291).
- Holloway, Lewis. "Subjecting Cows to Robots: Farming Technologies and the Making of Animal Subjects." *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, vol. 25, no. 6, 2007, pp. 1041-1060. *Sage Journals*, <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1068/d77j>.
- Holy Bible*, The New Revised Standard Catholic Edition. Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1990.
- Howe, Irving. "The Struggles of Men." *The Mayor of Casterbridge: Second Norton Critical Edition*, edited by Phillip Mallet, W. W. Norton, 1977, pp. 366-380.
- Huxley, T. H. *Evolution and Ethics*. Pilot, 1947.

Ingham, Patricia. "Introduction." *Jude the Obscure*, edited by Patricia Ingham, Oxford University Press, 2008, pp. xi-xxi.

James, Henry. "Review for *The Nation*, December 24, 1874." *Far from the Madding Crowd: Norton Critical Edition*, edited by Robert C. Schweik, W. W. Norton, 1986, pp. 367-368.

Kaufman, Dan. "How Suffering Farmers May Determine Trump's Fate." *The New Yorker*, 10 Aug. 2020, [https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/08/17/how-suffering-farmers-may-determine-trumps-fate?utm\\_source=onsite-share&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_campaign=onsite-share&utm\\_brand=the-new-yorker](https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/08/17/how-suffering-farmers-may-determine-trumps-fate?utm_source=onsite-share&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=onsite-share&utm_brand=the-new-yorker).

Keen, Suzanne. "Empathetic Hardy: Bounded, Ambassadorial, and Broadcast Strategies of Empathy." *Poetics Today*, vol. 32 no. 2, 2011, pp. 350 -389. *Duke University Press*, DOI: 10.1215/03335372-1162695

Kramer, Dale. "Hardy and Readers: *Jude the Obscure*." *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hardy*, edited by Dale Kramer, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 164–182.

Kreilkamp, Ivan. "Animal." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 46, no. 3-4, 2018, pp. 570-3. *Cambridge Core*, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1060150318000268>.

---. "Anthroprosthesis, or Prosthetic Dogs." *Victorian Review*, vol. 35, no. 2, 2009, pp. 36–41. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/41038834](http://www.jstor.org/stable/41038834).

---. "Dying Like a Dog in *Great Expectations*." *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representations of Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture*, edited by Deborah Deneholz Morse and Martin A. Danahay, Ashgate, 2007, pp. 81-94.

---. *Minor Creatures: Persons, Animals, and the Victorian Novel*. University of Chicago Press, 2018.

---. "Pitying the Sheep In *Far from the Madding Crowd*." *Novel: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 42, no. 3, 2009, pp. 474–481. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/27764348](http://www.jstor.org/stable/27764348).

Levine, George. *Darwin and the Novelists: Patterns of Science in Victorian Fiction*. Harvard University Press, 1988.

- Lewis, Helene. "Chapter 2: Social Darwinism: A Brief Outline of Social Darwinism and its Influence on 19th Century Britain and Elsewhere." *The Journal of Psychohistory*, vol. 44, no. 2, 2016, pp. 154-161. *ProQuest*, <https://www-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/scholarly-journals/chapter-2-social-darwinism-brief-outline/docview/1826244783/se-2?accountid=8330>.
- Lothe, Jakob. "Variants on Genre: *The Return of the Native*, *The Mayor of Casterbridge*, *The Hand of Ethelberta*." *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hardy*, edited by Dale Kramer, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 112–129. Cambridge Companions to Literature, <https://doi-org.virtual.anu.edu.au/10.1017/CCOL0521562023>.
- Loughnan, S., Haslam, N., and B, Bastian. "The Role of Meat Consumption in the Denial of Moral Status and Mind to Meat Animals." *Appetite*, vol. 55, iss. 1, 2010, pp. 156-159. *ScienceDirect*, doi:10.1016/j.appet.2010.05.043
- Lyons, Sara. "Thomas Hardy and the Value of Brains." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 48, no. 2, 2020, pp. 327–359. *Cambridge University Press*, doi:10.1017/S1060150318001572
- Mangum, Teresa. "Animal Angst: Victorians Memorialize their Pets." *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representations of Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture*, edited by Deborah Deneholz Morse and Martin A. Danahay, Ashgate, 2007, pp. 15-34.
- Martell, Jessica. "The Dorset Dairy, the Pastoral, and Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 68, no. 1, 2013, pp. 64–89. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ncl.2013.68.1.64](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ncl.2013.68.1.64).
- Mazzeno, Laurence W. and Ronald D. Morrison, editors. *Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture: Contexts for Criticism*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017.
- McKechnie, Claire Charlotte, and John Miller. "Victorian Animals: Introduction." *Journal of Victorian Culture*, vol. 17, no. 4, 2012, pp. 436-441. *Taylor and Francis Online*, <https://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13555502.2012.735448>.
- Meadowsong, Zena. "Thomas Hardy and the Machine: The Mechanical Deformation of Narrative Realism in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*." *Nineteenth-Century Literature*, vol. 64, no. 2, 2009, pp. 225–248. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ncl.2009.64.2.225](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1525/ncl.2009.64.2.225).
- Millgate, Michael. "Hardy's Achievement." *Far from the Madding Crowd: Norton Critical Edition*, edited by Robert C. Schweik, W. W. Norton, 1986, pp. 401-414.
- . *The Life and Work of Thomas Hardy*. University of Georgia Press, 1985.
- . *Thomas Hardy: A Biography Revisited*. Oxford University Press, 2004.

- Morgan, Benjamin. "Critical Empathy: Vernon Lee's Aesthetics and the Origins of Close Reading." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 55, no. 1, 2012, pp. 31-56. *ProQuest*, <https://www-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/scholarly-journals/critical-empathy-vernon-lees-aesthetics-origins/docview/1370896757/se-2?accountid=8330>.
- Morrell, Ray. *Thomas Hardy: Three Pastoral Novels*. Macmillan Education, 1987.
- Morrison, Ronald D. "Dickens, *Household Words*, and the Smithfield Controversy at the Time of the Great Exhibition." *Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture: Contexts for Criticism*, edited by Laurence W. Mazzeno and Ronald D. Morrison, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 41-63.
- . "Thomas Hardy and Animals." *Choice*, vol. 55, no. 4, 2017, pp. 459. *ProQuest*, <https://www.proquest.com/trade-journals/thomas-hardy-animals/docview/1967828397/se-2?accountid=8330>.
- Morse, Deborah Deneholz, and Martin A. Danahay, editors. *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representations of Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture*. Ashgate, 2007.
- Neave, Lucy. "'The Distance Between Them': Sheep, Women and Violence in Evie Myld's *All the Birds, Singing* and Barbara Baynton's *Bush Studies*." *Antipodes*, vol. 30, 2016, pp. 125-136. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.13110/antipodes.30.1.0125](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.13110/antipodes.30.1.0125).
- Ortiz-Robles, Mario. "Hardy's Wessex and the Natural History of Chance." *Novel: A Forum for Fiction*, vol. 49, no. 1, 2016, pp. 82-94. *Duke University Press*, <https://doi-org.virtual.anu.edu.au/10.1215/00295132-3458245>.
- . *Literature and Animal Studies*. Routledge, 2016.
- Palkovich, Einat Natalie. "The 'Mother' of All Schemas: Creating Cognitive Dissonance in Children's Fantasy Literature Using the Mother Figure." *Children's Literature in Education*, vol. 46, 2015, pp. 175-189. *Springer*, DOI 10.1007/s10583-015-9252-4
- Panagiotou, Elisavet and Irini Kadianki. "From Cognitive Dissonance to Cognitive Polyphasia: A Sociocultural Approach to Understanding Meat-Paradox." *The Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, vol. 49, iss. 2, 2019, pp. 235-253. *Wiley Online Library*, <https://doi-org.virtual.anu.edu.au/10.1111/jtsb.12201>.
- Panther, Marie. "Paganism in *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* and *Jude the Obscure*: The Possibility of Faith and Ethics in a Darwinian World." *Cahiers Victoriens & Édouardiens*, no. 80, 2014, pp. 2-11. *ProQuest*,

<https://search-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/docview/1788298061?accountid=8330>.

Pinion, F. B. "Jude the Obscure as Autobiography." *Jude the Obscure: Third Norton Critical Edition*, edited by Ralph Pite, W. W. Norton, 2016, pp. 411 -417.

Razaq, Abdur. "Symbolic Significance of Bird in Thomas Hardy's *The Mayor of Casterbridge*." *The Dialogue*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2011, pp. 187-195. *Qurtuba*, [http://www.qurtuba.edu.pk/thedialogue/The%20Dialogue/6 2/Dialogue April June2011\\_187-195.pdf](http://www.qurtuba.edu.pk/thedialogue/The%20Dialogue/6%20Dialogue%20April%20June2011_187-195.pdf).

Rebanks, James. *English Pastoral: An Inheritance*. Allen Lane, 2020.

Ritvo, Harriet. *The Animal Estate: The English and Other Creatures in the Victorian Age*. Harvard University Press, 1987.

Rollin, Bernard E. "This Ain't Agriculture." *Routledge Handbook of Human-Animal Studies*, edited by Susan McHugh and Garry Marvin, Taylor and Francis, 2014, pp. 84-96. *EBSCOHost*, <http://web.a.ebscohost.com.virtual.anu.edu.au/ehost/ebookviewer/ebook/bmxlYmtfXzc2MDc3Nl9fQU41?sid=b91a0502-beaa-44ed-9b22-62b23ddf84ae@fdc-v-sessmgr02&vid=0&format=EB&rid=1>.

Rothgerber, Hank. "Meat-related Cognitive Dissonance: A Conceptual Framework for Understanding How Meat Eaters Reduce Negative Arousal from Eating Animals." *Appetite*, vol. 146, 2020, pp. 1- 16. *Science Direct*, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2019.104511>.

Schweik, Robert. "The Influence of Religion, Science, and Philosophy on Hardy's Writings." *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hardy*, edited by Dale Kramer, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 54-72.

Seabrook, Martin F. "The Psychological Relationship Between Dairy Cows and Dairy Cowmen and its Implications for Animal Welfare." *International Journal for the Study of Animal Problems*, vol. 1, no. 5, 1980, pp. 295-298. *Animal Studies Repository*, [https://animalstudiesrepository.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1002&context=acwp\\_habr](https://animalstudiesrepository.org/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=https://www.google.com/&httpsredir=1&article=1002&context=acwp_habr).

Sewell, Anna. *Black Beauty*. Everyman's Library, 1993.

Sherman, George Witter. "Thomas Hardy and the Agricultural Laborer." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 71, no. 2, 1952, pp. 111-118. *JSTOR*, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3044298>.

- . "Thomas Hardy and the Lower Animals." *Prairie Schooner*, vol. 20, no. 4, 1946, pp. 304–309. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/40623800](http://www.jstor.org/stable/40623800).
- Shires, Linda M. "‘And I Was Unaware’: the Unknowing Omniscience of Hardy’s Narrators." *Thomas Hardy: Texts and Contexts*, editor P. Mallett, Palgrave Macmillan, 2002, pp. 31-48. *Springer Link*, [https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403919335\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1057/9781403919335_3).
- . "Narrative, Gender, and Power in *Far from the Madding Crowd*." *NOVEL: A Forum on Fiction*, vol. 24, no. 2, 1991, pp. 162–177. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/1345561](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1345561).
- . "The Radical Aesthetic of *Tess of the d’Urbervilles*." *The Cambridge Companion to Thomas Hardy*, edited by Dale Kramer, Cambridge University Press, 1999, pp. 145–163.
- Showalter, Elaine. "A ‘Biological Trap.’" *Jude the Obscure: Third Norton Critical Edition*, edited by Ralph Pite, W. W. Norton, 2016, pp. 418- 419.
- . "The Unmanning of the Mayor of Casterbridge." *The Mayor of Casterbridge: Second Norton Critical Edition*, edited by Phillip Mallett, 2001, pp. 391-405.
- Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*. Random House, 2015.
- Spencer, Herbert. *The Principles of Ethics 1: The Data of Ethics*. Williams and Norgate, 1892.
- Squires, Michael. "Far from the Madding Crowd as Modified Pastoral." *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, vol. 25, no. 3, 1970, pp. 299-326. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2933436](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2933436).
- Stephen, Leslie. "Ethics and the Struggle for Existence." *Contemporary Review, 1866-1900*, vol. 64, 1893, pp. 157-170. *ProQuest*, <https://www.proquest.com/docview/6965847?pq-origsite=summon&accountid=8330>.
- Stroup, William. "Henry Salt on Shelley: Literary Criticism and Ecological Identity." *Romantic Circles: Romanticism and Ecology*, 2001, <https://romantic-circles.org/praxis/ecology/stroup/stroup.html>.
- Sumpter, Caroline. "On Suffering and Sympathy: *Jude the Obscure*, Evolution, and Ethics." *Victorian Studies*, vol. 53, no. 4, 2011, pp. 665–687. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/victorianstudies.53.4.665](http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/victorianstudies.53.4.665).
- Sylvia, Richard. "Florence Henniker, Hardy, and the Anglo-Boer War Horses." *The Hardy Society Journal*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2011, pp. 51–68. *JSTOR*, [https://www.jstor.org/stable/48563676](http://www.jstor.org/stable/48563676).

- Tavris, Carol, and Elliot Aronson. *Mistakes Were Made (But Not By Me): Why We Justify Foolish Beliefs, Bad Decisions, and Hurtful Acts*. Harcourt, 2007.
- Taylor, Chloë. "Foucault and Critical Animal Studies: Genealogies of Agricultural Power." *Philosophy Compass*, vol. 8, no. 6, 2013, pp. 539-551. *Cloudfront*, <https://cloudfront.ualberta.ca/-/media/research/research-projects/0be7629aaf1248d28d20151fc12fba1a/e13aaea7d4ff4c73b397af386628d5ff/foucault-and-critical-animal-studies-final.pdf>.
- Thompson, Paul B. "The Ethics of Food Animal Production." *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies*, edited by Linda Kalof, Oxford University Press, 2014, pp. 278- 365. *Oxford Handbooks Online*, <https://www-oxfordhandbooks-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/view/10.1093/oxforb/9780199927142.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199927142>.
- Vaidis D. C. and Bran A. "Respectable Challenges to Respectable Theory: Cognitive Dissonance Theory Requires Conceptualization Clarification and Operational Tools." *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 10, 2019, pp. 1 - 11. *PMC*, doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01189
- Von Uexküll, Jakob. "An introduction to Umwelt." *Semiotica*, vol. 2001, no. 134, 2006, pp. 107-110. *De Gruyter Mouton*, <https://Ddoi.org/10.1515/semi.2001.017>.
- Ward, Sadie. *Seasons of Change: Rural life in Victorian and Edwardian England*. George Allen & Unwin, 1982.
- Welsh, James M. "Hardy and the Pastoral, Schlesinger and Shepherds: *Far from the Madding Crowd*." *Literature/Film Quarterly*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1981, pp. 79. *ProQuest*, <https://search-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/docview/1297370792?accountid=8330>.
- West, Anna. *Thomas Hardy and Animals*. Cambridge University Press, 2017.
- Woolf, Virginia. "Hardy's impression of Life." *The Mayor of Casterbridge: Second Norton Critical Edition*, edited by Phillip Mallett, 2001, pp. 324-325.

## Works Consulted

- Agamben, Giorgio. *The Open: Man and Animal*. Translated by Kevin Attell, Stanford University Press, 2003.
- Austen, Jane. *Emma*. Penguin, 2003.
- . *Mansfield Park*. Penguin, 2003.
- . *Persuasion*. Oxford University Press, 2004.
- . *Pride and Prejudice*. Campfire, 2013.
- . *Sense and Sensibility*. Penguin, 2003.
- Bronte, Charlotte. *Jane Eyre*. Penguin, 2003.
- Burn, Rebecca. *Bishop's Girl*. Odyssey, 2016.
- Carpenter, Richard C. "The Mirror and the Sword: Imagery in *Far from the Madding Crowd*." *Nineteenth Century Fiction*, vol. 18, no. 4, 1964, pp. 331-345. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2932729>.
- Crowhurst, Anne-Marie. *The Illumination of Ursula Flight*. Allen and Unwin, 2018.
- Dalton, Trent. *Boy Swallows Universe*. HarperCollins, 2018.
- Darby, H. C. "The Regional Geography of Thomas Hardy's Wessex." *Geographical Review*, vol. 38, no. 3, 1948, pp. 426 - 443. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/210904>.
- Derrida, Jacques. "Eating Well, or The Calculations of the Subject: An Interview with Jacques Derrida." *Who Comes After the Subject?*, edited by Eduardo Cadava, Peter Connor, and Jean-Luc Nancy, Routledge, 1991, pp. 96-119.
- Doerr, Anthony. *All the Light We Cannot See*. Scribner, 2014.
- Donnelly, Brian. "The Mock Wife: Maumbury, and *The Mayor of Casterbridge*." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 44, 2016, pp. 97-110. *Cambridge University Press*, doi:10.1017/S1060150315000443
- Donnelly, Brian. "The Mock Wife: Maumbury, and *The Mayor of Casterbridge*." *Victorian Literature and Culture*, vol. 44, 2016, pp. 97-110. *Cambridge University Press*, doi:10.1017/S1060150315000443
- Dorn, Maria. "I Won't be a Slave to the Past- I'll Love Where I Choose": Gender and Time Paradigms in *The Mayor of Casterbridge*." *The Thomas Hardy Journal*, vol. 27, 2012,

- pp. 114-126. *ProQuest*,  
<https://search-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/docview/1269462818?accountid=8330>.
- Enstice, Andrew. "The Farming Community." *Thomas Hardy: Three Pastoral Novels*, edited by R. P. Draper, Macmillan Education, 1987, pp. 146- 156.
- Feuerstein, Anna. "Chicken Embryos, Headless Frogs, and the Victorian Human-Animal Divide: Samuel Butler's Animal Epistemology." *Journal of Victorian Culture*, vol. 19, no. 2, 2014, pp. 198-215. *Taylor and Francis Online*,  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/13555502.2014.919078>.
- Fischler, Alexander. "An Affinity for Birds: Kindness in Hardy's "Jude the Obscure"." *Studies in the Novel*, vol. 13, no. 3, 1981, pp. 250. *ProQuest*,  
<https://search-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/docview/1297404692?accountid=8330>.
- Fudge, Erica. *Perceiving Animals*. MacMillan Press, 2000.
- Gabaldon, Diana. *Voyager*. Penguin, 2015. ---. *Drums of Autumn*. Penguin, 2018.
- Haraway, Donna. *The Companion Species Manifesto: Dogs, People and Significant Otherness*. Prickly Paradigm Press, 2003.
- Hassett, Michael E. "Compromised Romanticism in *Jude the Obscure*." *Nineteenth-Century Fiction*, vol. 25, no. 4, 1971, pp. 432-443. *JSTOR*, [www.jstor.org/stable/2933121](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2933121).
- Hind, Kathryn. *Hitch*. Hamish Hamilton, 2019.
- Honeyman, Gail. *Eleanor Oliphant is Completely Fine*. Viking, 2017.
- Izzard, Eddie. *Believe Me*. Penguin, 2017.
- James, P. D. *Death Comes to Pemberley*. Vintage, 2013.
- Jerome, K. Jerome. *Three Men in a Boat and Three Men on the Bummel*. Penguin Classics, 1999.
- Kaye, Laura. *English Animals*. Little Brown, 2017.
- Levine, George. "Thomas Hardy's *The Mayor of Casterbridge*: Reversing the Real." *Critical Essays on Thomas Hardy: The Novels*, edited by Dale Kramer, G. K. Hall & Co., 1990, pp. 169-190.

- Mayer, Jed. "Come Buy, Come Buy!": Christina Rossetti and the Victorian Animal Market." *Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture: Contexts for Criticism*, edited by Laurence W. Mazzeno and Ronald D. Morrison, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 213-232.
- McAlindon, Tom. "Shakespeare and Hardy: The Tragi-Comic Nexus." *Shakespeare Survey, 71: Re-Creating Shakespeare*, edited by Peter Holland, University of Cambridge, 2018, pp. 255-266.
- McCarthy, Kerry. "Think Veganism." *Tedx University Of Stirling, Youtube*, Nov. 2016, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nPdUMWGWE28>. Speech.
- McEwan, Ian. *Machines Like Me*. Jonathan Cape, 2019.
- McKay, Laura Jean. *The Animals in that Country*. Scribe, 2020.
- Michie, Elsie B. "Horses and Sexual/Social Dominance." *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representations of Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture*, edited by Deborah Deneholz Morse and Martin A. Danahay, Ashgate, 2007, pp. 145-167.
- Mitchell, David. *Black Swan Green*. Hodder & Stoughton, 2007.
- Moby. "Why I'm a Vegan." *Tedx Venice Beach, Youtube*, June 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6DgUb9w8mOY>. Speech.
- Morgan, Rosemarie. *Women and sexuality in the Novels of Thomas Hardy*. Routledge, 1988.
- Morgenstern, Erin. *The Night Circus*. Vintage, 2012.
- Morrell, Ray. *Thomas Hardy: Three Pastoral Novels*, Macmillan Education, 1987.
- Neave, Lucy. *Who We Were*. The Text Publishing Company, 2013.
- Nicholls, David. *Sweet Sorrow*. Hachette, 2019.
- Novik, Naomi. *Uprooted*. Del Rey, 2015. ---. *Spinning Silver*. Del Rey, 2018.
- O'Leary, Beth. *The Flatshare*. Quercus, 2019.
- Panther, Marie. "Paganism in Tess of the D'Urbervilles and Jude the Obscure: The Possibility of Faith and Ethics in a Darwinian World." *Cahiers Victoriens & Édouardiens (Online)*, no. 80, 2014, pp. 2-11. *ProQuest*, <https://search-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/docview/1788298061?accountid=8330>.
- Pratchett, Terry. *Lords and Ladies*. Corgi, 2005.

---. *Reaper Man*. Corgi, 2005.

Pullman, Philip. *His Dark Materials: Northern Lights*. Scholastic, 2019.

---. *His Dark Materials: The Subtle Knife*. Random House, 2001.

---. *His Dark Materials: The Amber Spyglass*. Laurel Leaf, 2003.

---. *The Book of Dust: La Belle Sauvage*. Penguin, 2018.

---. *The Book of Dust: The Secret Commonwealth*. Penguin, 2020.

Pyke, Susan. "Cathy's Whip and Heathcliff's Snarl: Control, Violence, Care, and Rights in *Wuthering Heights*." *Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture: Contexts for Criticism*, edited by Laurence W. Mazzeno and Ronald D. Morrison, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 167-187.

Rankin, Ian. *Mortal Causes*. St. Martin's, 1997.

Ritvo, Harriet. "Afterword." *Victorian Animal Dreams: Representations of Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture*, edited by Deborah Deneholz Morse and Martin A. Danahay, Ashgate, 2007, pp. 271-275.

Rooney, Sally. *Normal People*. Hogarth Press, 2019.

Sabah Abdul, Hameed S. "The Representation of Women in Thomas Hardy's *Tess of the d'Urbervilles*." *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature*, vol. 5, no. 7, 2016, pp. 91-95. *ProQuest*,  
<http://dx.doi.org.virtual.anu.edu.au/10.7575/aiac.ijalel.v.5n.7p.91>.

Shaffer, Mary Ann and Annie Barrows. *The Guernsey Literary and Potato Peel Pie Society*. Dial Press, 2018.

Spencer, Stuart, et al. "History and Ethics of Keeping Pets: Comparison with Farm Animals." *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, vol. 19, 2006, pp. 17-25. *Springer*, DOI 10.1007/s10806-005-4379-8.

Tartt, Donna. *The Secret History*. Vintage, 2004.

Tolkein, J. R. R. *The Hobbit*. Houghton Mifflin, 2002.

Vincent, Sam. *Blood and Guts: Dispatches from the Whale Wars*. Black Inc, 2014.

Waters, Sarah. *The Paying Guests*. Riverhead, 2014.

- Welsh, James M. "Hardy and the Pastoral, Schlesinger and Shepherds: *Far from the Madding Crowd*." *Literature/Film Quarterly*, vol. 9, no. 2, 1981, pp. 79. ProQuest, <https://search-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/docview/1297370792?accountid=8330>.
- Wetzel, G. "Contradictory Subtexts in Willa Cather's *O Pioneers!* and Thomas Hardy's *Far From the Madding Crowd*." *Great Plains Quarterly*, vol. 28, no. 4, 2008, pp. 277-291. Proquest, <https://search-proquest-com.virtual.anu.edu.au/docview/845248800?accountid=8330>.
- Wharton, William. *Franky Furbo*. Henry Holt, 1989.
- Wilson, Sarah. *First We Make the Beast Beautiful: A New Story About Anxiety*. Macmillan, 2017.
- Winters, Ed. "The Ostrich Effect. The Truth We Hide from Ourselves." *Tedx Lund University, Youtube*, March 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=nrVEYTSe-o8>. Speech.
- Winton, Tim. *Breath*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2008.
- . Eyrie. Hamish Hamilton, 2013.
- . *The Shepherd's Hut*. Hamish Hamilton, 2018.
- Wodehouse, P. G. *Aunts Aren't Gentlemen*. Penguin, 2002.
- . *Stiff Upper Lip Jeeves*. Everyman's Library, 2002.
- Woolf, Virginia. *The Voyage Out*. Penguin, 2006.
- Yeniyurt, Kathryn. "Black Beauty: The Emotional Work of Pretend Play." *Animals in Victorian Literature and Culture: Contexts for Criticism*, edited by Laurence W. Mazzeno and Ronald D. Morrison, Palgrave Macmillan, 2017, pp. 233- 250.
- Yorke, John. *Into the Woods: How Stories Work and Why We Tell Them*. Penguin, 2014.
- Young, Rosamund. *The Secret Life of Cows*. Good Life Press, 2015.